

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME X

OCTOBER, 1917

NUMBER 4

ZIONISM

KEMPER FULLERTON

OBERLIN, OHIO

About six o'clock on the morning of Oct. 12th, 1914, the Porto di Rodi dropped anchor off Jaffa. No one with a particle of historical imagination can look for the first time without a thrill on the scene that spread itself out before us in the long luxurious roll of the Mediterranean and the easy flowing lines of the distant hills. The little city stood opposite us black against the morning sunshine, which came pouring over the mountains and into the Philistine plain. On such a day some two thousand years ago a man had gone up to a house-top in that city. It was also at the sixth hour, though, being Jewish reckoning, this meant the dazzle of the noon. The man did not notice the sky effects. His attention was concentrated upon a curious phenomenon. An object like a great sheet seemed to be descending out of the sky. As it reached the level of the house-top and he was enabled to look into it, he found it full of all sorts of squirming things, every one of them unclean and very offensive. Disgusted at the sight, he was about to turn away when a command came from somewhere: "Rise, Peter, kill and eat." "But I cannot," the man said. "I have never eaten anything common or unclean." "What God hath cleansed make not thou common," replied the voice.

While the man stood wondering at the strange experience, there was a loud knocking at the door, and he was informed that a certain Cornelius, centurion of the Italian cohort, wished to speak to him about a matter touching the welfare of his soul!

Jerusalem, the capital of Judaea, looks eastward and backward; Jaffa, the port of Jerusalem, looks westward and forward. At Jaffa the truth was revealed that religion was to be no longer national but cosmopolitan, that from this port there was to radiate across the freedom of the seas in waves of light as rich and full and vivifying as the eastern sunshine the idea of a religion adapted to the needs of all mankind. *Ex Oriente Lux!*

But is a universal religion capable of keeping itself from secularization? Can a religion flexible enough to adapt itself to the needs of a Hottentot or a New York stockbroker have sufficient inner integrity and resisting power to withstand the tremendous pressures from without? Can religion survive without the unyielding bony structure of dogma and tradition? On the other hand, can it accomplish its world mission if its intended universal adaptability is to be checked and impeded by an anatomic structure incapable of the sinuousness of the serpent? This is the problem which is being worked out before our eyes in Judaism today. It is a problem which, equally, though somewhat less obviously, concerns Christianity also. Zionism is one attempt to solve this problem. For this reason we did not spend the few hours at our disposal before the train left for Jerusalem in a visit to the house of Simon the Tanner where the problem originated, but walked out, instead, to Tell Abib where an attempt is being made at its solution.

Of all the strange sights that greet the Western traveller in the Levant Tell Abib is in some respects the strangest. When we visited this little city it was only some five years old. But it had grown out of the sand

dunes just north of Jaffa with all the rapidity of Jonah's gourd and in 1914 numbered about five thousand inhabitants. In its neatness and concreteness, its uniformity and evident municipal efficiency, it might have been taken for a Gary or a Pullman, bodily transported by the rubbing of an Aladdin's lamp from the flats of Illinois to the flats of Philistia. Here was none of the narrowness or cramp of an old Oriental city, squeezed together by the lateral pressure of its walls of defense. Here were roomy avenues and pretty little public squares, the feeling of space, the suggestion of future expansion. It was of such a city that the prophet dreamed when he promised to the Jew a Jerusalem without walls, where the old men and the old women could sit in the sunshine and the children could play in the streets. One did not have to watch his steps in walking through the streets of Tell Abib, for the "filth of the streets," proverbial in the East, was not to be found here. A perfect sewage system had been installed. Trees had been planted along the sidewalks and in the parks, and were already relieving with their shade the dazzling whiteness of the little concrete houses in the hot October sun. They had been able to attain such wonderful growth in the short space of five years because of the fine municipal water-works, which had tapped the abundant supply of water lying only a few meters below the arid surface of the soil, and enabling irrigation to do its perfect work. Electric lights swung at the street corners. At one point in our walk through the town we passed a municipal theatre, at another a great school building, the largest building in Tell Abib, as finely and solidly built as a modern public-school building in our own country, well lighted, with wide cool halls and many recitation rooms.

There were two synagogues in the town; one, which I took to be the synagogue of the more liberal Jews, significantly located in this school building; the other, the

orthodox, in another quarter of the town. On our walk we had observed that the streets were deserted and we had also noticed the little artificial arbors erected in the courtyards or on the roofs of the houses. In the school building we learned the reason. It was the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles. We entered the liberal synagogue. The apparent lack of decorum in the average synagogue worship is at first the most striking feature to an onlooker, and the more orthodox it is the more tumultuous it becomes. Everybody is constantly moving about and prayer and conversation seem quite compatible in their simultaneousness. A young man whose features were almost feminine in their refinement was chanting what we took to be an ancient Hebrew melody, for it had the same curious and haunting cadences which characterized the Arab music with which we had become familiar, only it was more developed and melodic. The face of this young Levitical singer was tense with emotion. Whether the origin of his feeling was æsthetic and romantic or whether it expressed a genuine thirst for the living God I could not quite decide. There was no question of the genuineness of the emotion at the orthodox synagogue, however. Here men were gathered under their black and white prayer-mantles, whose fringes waved with the restless emotion of the worshippers beneath them. Just outside the door our attention was called to a timid-eyed, stoop-shouldered man. "That is Beiliss," we were told. We were looking at the victim of the latest and in some respects most celebrated of all the ritual-murder trials of modern times. Here he stood, saved in Tell Abib, but with the look of a hunted deer still clinging to him.

But we had come to Tell Abib to meet one of its chief promoters, to whom, through a happy accident of travel, we had secured letters of introduction. He was not at the orthodox synagogue, nor yet at the liberal synagogue.

We were therefore directed to his home, a comfortable modern villa. Dr. Ruppin, to whose energetic work Tell Abib owed so much of its prosperity, was seated at his study table on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles reading Bergson's *Creative Evolution*! Could anything have been more paradoxical, incongruous! Yet it has always seemed to me that the coincidence had a certain symbolism in it which I have been trying ever since to understand.

What is the relationship of the historical in religion to the essence of religion, of tradition to modernism, of a religion of dogma to religion in an era of science? How is religion to effect the transition from its past historical forms to the new forms or formlessness which scientific and historical inquiry seem to be necessitating, without losing its character as religion and merging itself into mere ethics or philosophical speculation? The man before me, reading *Creative Evolution* in the quiet of his study on the Feast of Tabernacles, while his orthodox fellow-citizens were worshiping under their prayer-mantles in the synagogues of the little city which he had done so much to bring into being, seemed to be the most remarkable embodiment which I had ever seen of these questions so disconcerting to the modern world. In the case of the Jew there is much less chance to dodge these questions than in the case of the Christian. The Christian can gradually abandon the orthodox tradition in which he has been brought up without ever becoming acutely conscious of having done so. In the transition he is not compelled to change from one clearly marked stage of culture to another; he still remains in a Christian civilization, and his associates and associations remain substantially the same. Unless he thinks hard and thinks straight he may never fully realize that he has made a fundamental change in his philosophy of life. But with the Jew it is different. When he abandons orthodoxy he

abandons the ancient Jewish culture and adopts an alien culture. His entire mode of life is revolutionized. For him, indeed, old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new, and *consciously* new. He cannot escape the necessity of looking down into the tremendous chasm which yawns between the Feast of Tabernacles and Creative Evolution. It is this which makes the study of present-day Judaism so instructive to the Christian. The problem of the Christian is in essence the same as the problem of the Jew—the problem, namely, of adjusting himself to an undogmatic form of religion without at the same time ceasing to be religious. But because the problem is more obvious in Judaism, its outlines more clear-cut, a study of it is of the greatest service in awakening Christian thought upon it.

Dr. Ruppin introduced us to his secretary, Miss Cohen, of Cleveland, Ohio, and after going up to his house-top (the only Orientalism connected with our visit) to get a bird's-eye view of Tell Abib, we were accompanied by them on a tour of inspection through the city and had it interpreted to us. Tell Abib is thus far probably the completest expression of Zionism. It is a home in Palestine for the oppressed Jews of all nations, a home in which they can develop unhampered what they believe to be their own peculiar culture and their religion as the most important element in that culture, and where, because of their isolation, they can make the attempt to adjust themselves at the same time to the culture of the modern world without becoming extinguished by it. Tell Abib means practically Springtime, Renaissance. Here, it is hoped, the Jewish people will experience a new birth. The city administration is entirely in the hands of the Jews themselves. In taxation, in the judiciary, in the police administration, Tell Abib is autonomous. What is of at least equal importance, the official language of the municipality is Hebrew, not Yiddish but the classical

Hebrew! It is revised, of course, to suit modern needs, but the attempt is made to develop it organically out of the Old Testament and the Talmud. If the community does not possess a word to meet its needs it sends to a philological committee which sits in Jerusalem and secures one. It is especially through this use of the Hebrew language that the effort is made to preserve the peculiar culture of the Jew. In its isolation from a dominant Western culture, in its use of Hebrew which is favored by this isolation, in its public-school system in which the Jewish child is introduced to modern culture through the medium of his own language, and in its connection with the previously established agricultural colonies of Palestine, Tell Abib is the completest embodiment of Zionism, the attempt of Judaism to preserve itself from disintegration as it emerges into the modern world. Will it succeed? In order to answer this question it is necessary to give a brief review of its origin and development.

In origin Zionism is the immediate outgrowth of anti-Semitism and can only be understood in the light of that movement. Anti-Semitism is not simply a recrudescence of the mediæval religious antipathy to the Jew, though that antipathy is no doubt found in it, especially among the Russian peasantry. It is the result of two great movements in the nineteenth century—the economic transition to the industrial era, and the new emphasis upon nationalism. At the end of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century the democratic spirit which produced the American and French revolutions also operated in favor of Jewish emancipation. It was in this period that the Ghetto was practically abolished throughout Europe, though in Russia the establishment of the Pale of Settlement in 1791 became in a way its substitute. In this period the Jews of western Europe as contrasted with the Jews in eastern Europe became practically free, politically. The immediate consequence

of emancipation in western Europe is seen in the new status of the Jew in the industrial world.

The era of emancipation coincided to a very large extent with the development of industrialism in Europe. Now throughout the Middle Ages the Jew had been confined for his livelihood very largely to money-lending, as this occupation was prohibited to the Christian. But the money-lender was at this time the usurer. He loaned money to Christians who were in financial needs. This did not tend to his popularity. Further, because of the fact that his calling was not recognized by the law and was exposed to great risks, the interest charged was proportionately high. This increased the popular ill-will toward him. But with the rise of industrialism money-lending, as Dr. Ruppín points out,¹ took on a new form. It now became banking, and was utilized not to stave off bankruptcy but to initiate business. The Jewish money-lender was no longer a leech, sucking the blood out of the needy Christian; he became the ally of the Christian in his industrial enterprises. Again, because money-lending now became a legalized practice, it was not necessary for the Jew to charge his former extortionate interest rates in order to protect himself against the risks of his business. Thus the odium of money-lending passed away, because, as Dr. Ruppín would have us believe, Christian business now adopted Jewish methods. No more striking instance of the change from the view of the Jew as a usurer to the view of him as a capitalist, is to be found than in the first recognition of the Jews in England. It was the city of London which was the first city in England to look upon them with a friendly eye, and as early as 1668 Sir Joseph Child, governor of the East India Company, "pleaded for their naturalization on the score of their commercial ability."² As a capitalist

¹ *The Jews of Today*. Henry Holt & Co.

² *Encyclopædia Britannica*, XV, p. 406.

the Jew began to take his place in European civilization among the bourgeoisie, the great industrial middle class, and because his instinct for trade had been sharpened by the bitter experiences of the Middle Ages, he soon began to exercise an influence in this class out of all proportion to his numbers. But the industrial class had become the most powerful class in Europe. The Jew, therefore, as one of the most influential members of this class, at once attained a commanding position. The consequence was that the very movement which had resulted in his emancipation almost automatically forced him into a situation which was calculated to rouse new jealousies and oppositions.

These were still further aggravated by another development in European thought. The great tidal wave of democracy, which originated in the French political earthquake at the fall of Louis Philippe and the establishment of the Second Republic (Feb., 1848) and rapidly swept over Germany and Austria, was followed by a heavy groundswell of nationalism. This is most clearly seen in the movement for the unification of Germany. Hegel also, who wrote in the first half of the century, had developed a system of ethics in which the theory was advanced that the life of the State is the culmination of ethical development. But the State must be a unit like the individual; ideally it must contain no heterogeneous element within it. At once the question arises, What is the relationship of the Jew to the State? Is Judaism a religious or a racial phenomenon? In the former case the Jew might reasonably be expected to coalesce with the State in which he was born; in the latter case he would be regarded as an alien and therefore a dangerous element in the State by those who accepted Hegel's theories of nationality and ethics. Thus with the emergence of the Jew out of his Ghetto as a leading factor in the new industrial era on an equality with the Christian before

the law and a successful competitor, and with the insistence in Europe upon the principle of nationality, which was favored by the most important democratic movements of the time and encouraged by one of its most influential philosophers, a new and very serious crisis was prepared for the Jews.

It was precipitated in Germany in 1873 in the movement known as anti-Semitism and spread like wildfire throughout Europe. In 1873 the wild speculations due to the unexpectedly speedy payment of the French indemnity, had run their usual course and a great crash came. Many Jews were involved in the financial scandals. In the same year a pamphlet was published by a certain Wilhelm Marr on *The Victory of Judaism over Germanism*, in which Hegel's doctrine of the State was made the basis of an attack upon the Jews as an alien element. By 1879 anti-Semitism had become a burning political question. The brilliant writer of the article on anti-Semitism in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, from which this brief sketch of it is mainly drawn, lays the responsibility for this upon Bismarck. The Jews had been very prominent in the National Liberal Party, which had been the chief support of Bismarck in his unification of the Empire. But conditions had changed, and this party had now become distasteful to him. It is suggested that Bismarck utilized the anti-Semitic sentiment in order to bring the party into discredit. The Conservatives and the Catholic Centre could be relied upon in the contest; the first because they represented agrarian capitalists who were naturally suspicious of the industrial capitalists, the second because they had old scores to pay off for the activity of the Jews in the *Kulturkampf*. An anti-Semitic League was formed in Berlin and Dresden, and the movement was launched. The two most conspicuous anti-Semitic leaders were Pastor Stöcker, who, as head of the so-called Christian Socialists, formulated more particularly the

economic indictment against the Jews, and Hermann Ahlwardt, who urged especially the racial indictment (Marr's book went through nine editions in 1879). The latter attack was by far the more bitter and unscrupulous and calculated to rouse the passions of the ignorant. This led to mob demonstrations and in 1892 to the revival of the ritual-murder charge, while in the literary propaganda some went so far as to reject not only the Old Testament but Christianity itself as expressions of Semitism.

The movement lost ground in Germany in the decade 1892-1903, but acquired new vigor in 1903-07. This is significant, for it is in these years that Jingoism and Anglo-phobia became rampant in Germany in connection with the great naval programme and the adoption of *Welt Politik*. The movement thus begun in Germany spread into Austro-Hungary, and finally culminated in Russia in the enactment of the infamous May laws of 1882 and the massacres of Kishineff (1903), Odessa and Bielostok (1905), while in France it issued in the unspeakable scandals of the Dreyfus trials (1894-1906). It will be seen that anti-Semitism ran its course in the quarter of a century 1880 to 1906. Wherever the movement is examined it is found sooner or later to become inextricably involved in the struggle between the reactionary and nationalistic ideals in Europe on the one hand and the progressive and cosmopolitan ideals on the other. It is this which makes the study of anti-Semitism so instructive. While it is probably a transient phenomenon, it has left two historical changes behind it of vast significance. The first is the migration of nearly two million east-European Jews into the United States, the direct result of the persecution of the Jews. The consequences of this upon the economic, social, and religious life of this country are simply incalculable. The other change for which anti-Semitism is at least indirectly responsible is the denunciation by the French government of the Concordat and

the disestablishment of the French Church. This momentous event grew, at least in part, out of the anger of the French government at the clericals who had played a very prominent part in the opposition to Dreyfus. But what has all this to do with Zionism?

That the two movements are intimately connected historically is suggested by the date at which the Zionist movement was inaugurated. This was in 1896. We have seen how the anti-Semitic movement began and practically ran its course in the last decades of the nineteenth century. It was therefore just in the midst of this frenzy that the Austrian Jew, Theodor Herzl, published his *Judenstaat* (1896). He proposed in effect that the Jews should accept the premise of their opponents, admit that they were a nation, and hence seek to establish themselves as a nation in some unoccupied part of the world, preferably Palestine. A number of congresses were held, great enthusiasm was aroused, and in 1903 an offer was actually secured from Lord Lansdowne of a large tract of land in East Africa for colonization purposes. But this was bitterly opposed by many of the Zionists themselves, who believed that only in Palestine was there any hope of setting up successfully a Jewish state.

The scheme of Herzl at once created a great division in Judaism. Western Judaism had for the most part followed in the wake of what was known as the Mendelssohnian movement. Moses Mendelssohn, grandfather of the celebrated composer, believed that the hope of Judaism lay in the adoption of Western culture. Judaism according to him was a religion, not a racial or nationalistic phenomenon. The Jew was a cosmopolitan, in England an Englishman, in Germany a German. The true tie was that of religion, rather than of race. This movement was favored by the cosmopolitan tendencies of the French Revolution. Thus, the Jewish Sanhedrin convoked by Napoleon in 1807 asserted the citizenship and

patriotism of the Jew in France, and agreed to adapt the law of the synagogue, particularly the crucial laws of marriage and divorce, to the law of the land.³ It was largely owing to the assertion of these cosmopolitan principles that the Jews were so successful in gaining emancipation at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries.⁴ Hence the theories of Herzl seemed to many to signify the abandonment of those principles by means of which the Jews had been delivered from the Ghetto. To adopt Zionism was to acquiesce in one of the most dangerous premises of their enemies, and admit that they were an alien element in the nations in which they were living. The powerful movement known as Reformed Judaism which had arisen in the nineteenth century as a logical result of the emancipation of the Jews and their adoption of Western culture, has therefore rejected Herzl's ideas and combated them with the greatest vigor.

The principles of this movement are summed up in classic form in the declarations of the Pittsburgh Conference of American Rabbis in 1885. The fifth declaration reads in part: "We consider ourselves no longer a nation but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish State."⁵ The thought of this paragraph is reiterated again and again by the leaders of Reformed Judaism. Dr. Kohler, for example, who was president of the Pittsburgh Conference, insisted that Judaism is a religious truth, intrusted to a nation but destined to interlink all nations as a cosmopolitan factor

³ Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, pp. 26 ff. Many of the facts in what follows I owe to this book and to newspaper clippings from the files of Dr. Philipson which he has kindly placed at my disposal.

⁴ Cf. the anonymous article on Zionism in the *Fortnightly Review*, November, 1916.

⁵ Philipson, p. 492.

in humanity. He repudiated the idea that Judaea is to be the home of the Jew; such a principle would "unhome" the Jew the world over. As long ago as 1841 the Jewish congregation of Beth Elohim in Charleston, S.C., declared that "this country is our Palestine, this city our Jerusalem," and along similar lines are the recent utterances of such leaders of Reformed Judaism as Dr. Schulmann, Dr. Rosenau, and Dr. Philipson. Zionism is, according to Dr. Schulmann, the child of the last decades of the nineteenth century, which emphasized racialism and nationalism as against the earlier principles of individualism, democracy, and cosmopolitanism. He adds very significantly that the divisions of Judaism on this point endanger the problem of the Jew in the coming peace conference. "God forbend," exclaims Dr. Rosenau, "that Israel should be given to the emphasis of nationalism, which is responsible for the national hatreds of the present." According to Dr. Philipson the "race-Jew" is the cause of anti-Semitism. "The Reformed Jews are Internationalists. They cherish the idea of universalism, toward which scientific discoveries, remarkable inventions which bring the most distant parts of the earth into close touch with one another, treaties of peace and arbitration among the nations, seem to point," and they take their stand "on the idealistic interpretation of history, whereof we believe that Israel presents the most striking symbol as over against the nationalistic interpretation whereof the present war, the apotheosis of nationalism, is the climax."⁶

⁶ The above citations are interesting reflections of the way in which the present war is aggravating the theological differences of Judaism. Already the possible effects of the peace settlement upon the future of Palestine have become an absorbing question for all Jews. It may also be noticed in passing that not a few among the orthodox have also been suspicious of the Zionist propaganda. The reason is partly theological, and is expressed in the following extract from a letter of Mr. Jacob Schiff to the American Hebrew of Sept. 22, 1907: "The political doctrine of Zionism has nothing in common with the Jewish Messianic hope. There is no Scripture warrant for attempting to establish the Jewish nation by human endeavor. To attempt to force the hand of Providence is always unprofitable."

The fundamental principle for which Judaism as a religion stands is, of course, according to all Reformed Jews, its "God-idea," i.e. its monotheism. The rabbinical law, represented especially by the *Shulhan Arukh*, the codification of Talmudic Law compiled by Joseph Caro in the sixteenth century in the attempt to check the threatened disintegration of Judaism at the time of the Spanish expulsion, is discarded by Reformed Judaism. Judaism is a religion of development, and the ceremonialism of the law is only one historical phase. It is not of the essence of Judaism. Its essence is monotheism. The ceremonial must be discarded because it is absolutely out of touch with modern life, and if Judaism is chained to it it will inevitably die. Thus Reformed Judaism would save Judaism first by rejecting the idea that the Jews are a nation and by insisting upon the idea that they are a religious community, and secondly by discarding the vast accumulation of ceremonialism which has expressed the beliefs and hopes of past phases of Judaism and by insisting upon the principle of monotheism as its essence.

To all this Zionism retorts seriatim: Without a nucleus of Jews forming a Jewish nation and permitted to develop its own peculiar Jewish culture unhampered by a superior enveloping culture, the Jewish religion will be lost to the world. If the Jew remains in Western civilization, in the end he will be inevitably absorbed by it. The inducements to conform to the dominant Christian civilization will be too powerful to be permanently resisted. Again it is claimed, it is not the principle of monotheism which has preserved the Jew through the centuries of the dispersion. It is the Law, particularly the ritual law, the dietary regulations and Sabbath observance, which has kept the Jew a peculiar people and prevented assimilation. If the ritual law is abandoned, as the Reformed Jews demand, and if the Jews are at the

same time scattered through the Christian nations with no opportunity to develop their own peculiar culture such as they would enjoy if at least a nucleus of them could remain apart by themselves, the future of Judaism is hopeless. These are the theses of Dr. Ruppin's book *The Jews of Today*. Space forbids us to give in what follows more than a brief résumé of Dr. Ruppin's arguments.

We have seen how in the new era of industrialism the economic status of the Jew became suddenly changed. From a usurer he became a capitalist. The economic distinction between Jew and Christian which had endured for so many generations was thus wiped out. This at once paved the way for assimilation, especially in view of the fact that the Jew speedily occupied a very prominent place in industrialism. But where there is economic progress there is always a declining birth-rate. While the east-European Jew had families of six or ten, his west-European coreligionist began to have families of only two or three. The Jews have always been a prolific race, for marriage and the rearing of children have been considered religious duties. What was lost through assimilation in times gone by had thus been usually made good through the fertility of the race. But this offset to assimilation now becomes abolished in the course of economic development.

Another factor connected with the economic progress of the Jews is their congestion in large cities. The ten cities, New York (about 1,000,000), Warsaw, Buda-Pesth, Odessa, London, Vienna, Chicago, Philadelphia, Berlin, and Paris, contain about one-fifth of the total Jewish population of the world (12,000,000). But large cities are notably centers of religious indifference as compared with rural districts. The life of the town is emphatically a secular life. The Jews in large cities are engaged in the same callings as Christians, which naturally leads

them to associate with Christians, and because of the religious indifference of the city apostasy does not make a Jew a marked man as it would in the country. Assimilation therefore becomes especially easy in metropolitan centers.

Another marked development in modern Judaism is the abandonment of Yiddish and Spaniolisch. These are the mother-tongues of a great majority of Jews and are associated with all that they have been accustomed to hold dear in their religious and racial life. The adoption of the language of a country usually means the adoption of its manners and customs, which is a long step toward assimilation. Dr. Ruppin goes so far as to say that the Jewish religion is on firm ground only where Yiddish is spoken. If this is true, one can see how significant is the fact that more than one-third of the Jews no longer speak their mother-tongues.

But the most important step toward assimilation of the Jew, for which his economic development and the abandonment of his native tongue have paved the way, is his adoption of modern, that is Christian, culture. This is seen on the one hand in the decline of the Cheder or the Talmudic schools, in which only religious and distinctively Hebrew subjects are taught, and on the other hand in the crowding of Jewish children and youth into the public schools and institutions of higher learning. To take just one group of instances, there were in proportion to their numbers four times as many Jews as Christians in Austria (statistics of 1903-04), six times as many in Hungary (1907), and seven times as many in Prussia (1886-91). If the Roman Catholic looks upon the public schools and universities as dangerous to his religion, and if even dogmatic Protestantism seeks to protect itself against secular education by the denominational school and college, how much more fatal is secular education in Christian lands to Judaism! "It is as rare," Dr. Ruppin

asserts, "to find a Cheder pupil who discards the uses of his religion as it is to find a university Jew who holds fast to them" (p. 135 f.).⁷

Modern education is really incompatible with Jewish orthodoxy. A child brought up in its atmosphere becomes estranged from its orthodox parents and the ties which bind it to its past are easily broken. Thus secular education, which the Jews are drinking in with such avidity, is the precursor of what threatens to be a complete break with the past. Reformed Jew and Zionist are both alike aware of this effect of modern education. The Reformed Jew seeks to offset it by reinterpreting his religion, the Zionist by isolating the Jew in Palestine. With the breakdown of the economic and linguistic distinctions between the Jew and the Christian, with the congestion of the Jews in large cities and the abandonment of the Talmudic education in favor of secular education, it is not astonishing to find a painfully increasing indifference to religion. So long as the Jew was confined by the Christian to the Ghetto his religion was his all in all. In it he lived and moved and had his being, and he does so yet where he is not affected by modern culture, as is the case with most east-European Jews. But once let the economic and educational influences of modern civilization begin to play upon his religion, and it would appear to be doomed in its most distinctive elements, as the Zionists express it, or at least in those elements which keep the Jew distinct from his fellow-men, as the Reformed Jews would perhaps prefer to express it.

As we have seen, it is not the monotheistic principle which primarily distinguishes the Jew; it is his ceremonial laws, especially Sabbath observance, dietary laws, and

⁷ The history of the Mendelssohn family is the classical illustration of the influence of modern education upon the Jew. Moses Mendelssohn was the champion of modern learning, and his translation of the Old Testament into German did for the Jew what Luther's translation did for the German. But while Mendelssohn himself remained true to the Law his descendants became Christians.

prohibition of mixed marriages. These laws come to the orthodox Jew as immediate commands of God. They are not principles nor even illustrations of principles but statutory law. They are not to be obeyed because of their inherent reasonableness or because they are capable of a spiritual self-authentication, but because they are enacted by divine authority. Now it is impossible to preserve one's faith in the divine and perpetually binding character of these laws in the face of modern knowledge. Economic pressure and historical criticism alike combine to destroy faith in them. And when faith in them as divine statutes is destroyed the next thing is to abandon their observance. When Peter shrank from eating the unclean contents of the heavenly sheet, his scrupulousness was justified if it was his desire to remain a Jew. As surely as he ate those things, just so sure was it that he or his spiritual descendants would cease to be Jews. As a matter of fact this is what happens wherever the Jew listens to the imperious command of economic necessity, as in the case of Sabbath observance, or to the teachings of science and history, as in the case of most of the other customs of his ancestral religion. There remains, therefore, to bind him to his coreligionists only his belief in monotheism. This tie alone in the opinion of Zionists as represented by Dr. Ruppin is altogether insufficient. Even though his racial attachment may keep him from immediate conversion to Christianity, the facts teach us that he is apt to become altogether indifferent to religion, and while he may remain for a time formally within the pale of Judaism the chances are that he will finally succumb and go over to Christianity.

Perhaps the most significant fact of all that testifies to the rapid disintegration of Jewish religious life is the increase of mixed marriages in western Europe. Since the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the law against mixed marriages has been the most effective means of self-pro-

tection which Judaism has possessed. But in the Sanhedrin assembled by Napoleon, in which, as we have seen, the cosmopolitanism of the French Revolution was especially influential, it was decided that the Law expressly forbade only marriage with Canaanites.⁸ Since there were no longer any Canaanites, the inapplicability of the law to present conditions was sufficiently obvious. The fact that marriage had also been changed from a purely religious to a civil contract also favored mixed marriages. While there are practically no mixed marriages in eastern Europe, the practice steadily increases as we move westward and find the Jew securing economic independence and modern culture, though of course it has been checked in some measure by anti-Semitism. The effect of mixed marriages upon assimilation is clearly seen in the education of the children; in most cases they are brought up as Christians. The last stage in the assimilative process is conversion to Christianity and baptism. Here too the defection is far greater than is commonly supposed. While conversion in the evangelical sense, that is, conversion through the various missions to the Jews, is practically negligible, conversion due to economic and social reasons is frequent.

Basing himself upon the above arguments which are supported by very carefully worked out statistical tables, Dr. Ruppin concludes that Judaism is doomed unless something very definite can be done to check the assimilative process. It is true the east-European Jew is as yet largely unaffected by the influences to which the west-European Jew has been subjected. But as industrialism makes its way into Roumania, Galicia, Bukowina, and above all Russia, and as the Jews in those countries secure the same political rights and educational opportunities enjoyed by their western coreligionists, there is no reason to hope that they will not follow the same line of development as their western kindred, give up all

⁸ Ruppin, p. 159, n. 1.

that is distinctively Jewish and ultimately become merged into the Christian population which surrounds them. Thus the only hope of the Jew, according to Dr. Ruppín, is, first, to be placed in a position where he can return to the soil; this will make him economically independent and secure for him a stability which his commercial instincts do not now permit him to enjoy. In the next place, there must be local segregation, so that he will not be continually tempted to conform to the dominant western, that is, Christian, culture. He must be taught modern science in his own language, so that it will not come to him in an alien form. If modern knowledge is acquired through the medium of Hebrew, he will be enabled, it is hoped, to adjust himself to the new world of thought without breaking too violently with the past. Lastly, he must be taught in his own schools, and the culture of the east-European Jew, which is the only strictly Jewish culture still surviving, must be made the basis of the new educational development. These conditions for the preservation of the Jewish race and Jewish culture can be found, it is claimed, only in Palestine. Hence the proposal of the Zionist to solve the problem of Judaism by the erection of a Jewish state in Palestine.

Zionism appeals strongly to the sentimental and romantic instincts of the Jew and even of the Christian.⁹ Furthermore, it is not inconceivable that in the settlement to follow on the present war, especially if the Ottoman Empire is overthrown, Palestine may be formed into a neutral Jewish state, which would give to Zionism a standing in the domain of practical politics which it does not now possess. But looked at from the point of view of theory, it is doubtful whether Zionism can be regarded as a permanently satisfactory solution of the problem before Judaism. It is avowedly based on economic and social considerations. Zionism, at least as represented

⁹ Temperamentally it may be compared to the Pusey movement in the Anglican Church.

by its protagonists, also adopts modernism. It is in no sense a return to Jewish orthodoxy. But can its desire to preserve the Jew by isolating him be fulfilled unless it frankly adopts the orthodox standpoint and isolates him spiritually, as it were, as well as locally? The Jewish people after the Exile were reorganized on a distinctively religious basis, and it was that which gave to the new community its stability. Zionism would preserve Jewish culture. But the Jewish culture of which Dr. Ruppin speaks is synonymous with the Jewish religion as that has been developed under the tutelage of orthodoxy. Can the one be preserved without the other? If Dr. Ruppin's arguments that the abandonment of orthodoxy means the doom of Judaism in western Europe are sound, will they not hold good for the fate of Judaism in Palestine as well? Is it to be supposed for a moment that Palestine will remain as secluded from the western world as it is at present? The chances are overwhelmingly against it. The restless West will not leave the brooding East alone, and it is not at all unlikely that we or our children will see the work of Alexander, so far as Nether Asia is concerned, completed. Will a Jewish nucleus in Palestine be able to separate itself from the irresistible march of events? After all, are those spiritual goods for which the Feast of Tabernacles and Creative Evolution respectively stand, really compatible? Is not Zionism, attractive as it is, really an anachronism, as the Reformed Jews assert? Reformed Judaism would seem to be on a far sounder basis when it seeks to solve the problem of Judaism by reinterpreting it in terms of modern life.

On the other hand, what answer can be made to the overwhelming array of arguments produced by Dr. Ruppin, that the principle of monotheism alone is insufficient to prevent Judaism from completely evaporating in time in a Christian atmosphere? The problem of the Jew is indeed a painful one and should be studied by the

Christian student with sympathy, for in it as in a magnifying-glass he may perceive the problem which is pressing ever more closely upon himself, the problem, namely, of the reconciliation of a dogmatic religion with modern culture. Catholicism, Greek and Roman, corresponds in Christianity to the orthodoxy of the east-European Jew. Protestantism, with its ever closer approximation to secular culture, corresponds to the Judaism of western Europe. As cosmopolitan culture advances, what effect will it have on Protestantism? Will it have the same effect as it has on the Jew? Will Peter's obedience to the command that came to him on the house-top of Simon the Tanner at Jaffa and which broke down nationalism in religion and introduced the era of cosmopolitanism, prove to be the first step in the merging of not only Judaism but Christianity itself into the general movement of civilization, in which dogmatic religion will have no place? These are some of the questions which a study of contemporary Judaism unavoidably raises, but which it is not the purpose of this article to answer.

AMERICAN, ENGLISH, AND DUTCH
THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION¹

KIRSOPP LAKE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

To the student of differing methods of education the chief interest of a comparison between English, Continental, and American methods is that the first two represent entirely different views as to objects and methods, while American education is a compromise between them. It is therefore perhaps desirable before proceeding to discuss theological education in particular to develop a little more fully the general characteristics of the three forms.

The most important characteristic of English education is that in the English university the period of training in general culture, as distinct from professional instruction, is carried on longer, further, and to a more advanced stage than in any other country. The normally well-educated Englishman lives at a boarding-school, commonly known as a public school, from thirteen to between eighteen and nineteen. During this time he is taught Latin and Greek extremely well, mathematics not very well, French and German rather badly. He is encouraged, and if necessary forced, to acquaint himself with the general outlines of ancient and modern history, and with the classics of English literature. He is given no instruction in what is known as English,²

¹An address delivered before the Alumni Association of the Harvard Divinity School, June 20, 1917.

²The amount of time spent on this subject in an American school seems to most Britishers to be an appalling waste. The English boy who is taught it indirectly seems more frequently to achieve an approximation to grammatical idiom than the American boy who is taught it directly. But of course this is only possible where Latin and Greek are taught well, which is rarely the case in America.

except in so far as he is made to write correct English when translating other languages, is from time to time required to write essays, and is examined at intervals on what is called general information. I never had a lesson in my life primarily on English grammar, nor have most of my friends. The result is that a normally intelligent boy of eighteen and a half can generally be trusted to translate Latin and Greek into English or English into Latin and Greek with a considerable degree of idiomatic skill. He has probably no very accurate knowledge of dates but a fairly good grasp of the general outlines of the history of the world. Curiously and tragically enough, the part which he knows least well is that of modern Europe. At this stage he goes on to Oxford or Cambridge, where the education given him is merely the continuation and intensification of what he has already received. He has an abundant choice of "electives" at this point, but in general must choose between a combination of classics, history, and philosophy on the one hand, or mathematics and natural science on the other. His degree at the end of his career depends on his general knowledge of these subjects and not on the number of courses which he has followed; theoretically he need follow none. But in any case the education he receives is concerned entirely with his general culture, and has nothing to do with any professional or technical requirements.

Another characteristic of this education is that it is directed chiefly to the acquisition and accurate idiomatic expression of codified knowledge. The student is taught with great thoroughness and skill the existing state of knowledge on the subject which he is studying, but he is not encouraged to study problems which are unsolved or to think that it is his business or anybody else's to solve them. The result is that Oxford turns out every year a number of men who are admirably qualified

to give a good and pleasant exposition of philosophy or history. Nor is this exposition merely superficial; it goes to the bottom of things and leaves out nothing so far as codification has been reached. It is not superficial; but it is stationary and somewhat timid. It does not encourage men to attempt the solution or even the presentation of fresh problems, and therefore the amount of original work ever produced by these men is pitifully small. After all, there is no way which secures such a pleasant and rounded presentation of a case as an inability to see its limitations, so that that divine discontent with generally accepted solutions which inspires the researcher is a drawback rather than a help to the attainment of the highest distinction in an English university. It is often remarked that young Oxford lecturers produce little good original work. The cause has been sought in many directions, but I think the truth is that the system of training and examination encourages sterile brilliancy. They do not produce because they cannot.

The general result, therefore, is that by the age of twenty-three, when the normal Englishman takes his A.B. degree, he is an extremely well-educated man in codified knowledge with no professional or technical training, and has perhaps been injured rather than helped for any purpose of scientific research by the training through which he has passed. I believe that there has been a tendency in the modern-science schools at Cambridge to try to remedy this defect, and Professor Firth at Oxford has struggled hard to introduce a better state of things in the history school at Oxford.

If a man needs professional training he will probably begin it at this stage, and his comparatively advanced age will inevitably make him try to obtain it quickly and cheaply. The result is that beyond controversy advanced technical or professional education in England is bad, compared with that in other great countries.

The situation on the Continent is entirely different. It would probably be best to take Germany as typical, but as I know the Dutch very much better than I do any other Continental nation, I take Holland. There is in point of fact very little difference between any of the Teutonic countries. In Holland a boy goes to a day-school, either to the Gymnasium or to the Hoogeberger-school. In the first he is taught Latin, Greek, English, German, French, history, geography, mathematics, and elementary science. In the latter Greek is omitted and science is emphasized. The teaching is good and very intensive. A Dutch boy probably works nearly twice as many hours every year as an American boy, who does less work than any child that I have ever met. School begins at half-past eight in the morning, continues, if I remember rightly, until twelve, with an interval of twenty minutes somewhere in the middle of the morning, goes on again for two hours in the afternoon, and ends up with an hour or more of home work. Moreover the school year begins at the end of September and goes on until almost the end of July. Experience made me think that this scheme of education was too strenuous; but most of the Dutch children live through it without grievous harm, though I doubt if English or American boys could do so. The result is that somewhere between eighteen and nineteen they know about as much as the ordinary American A.B. and decidedly more than a boy of the same age in England, though not so much as an Englishman when he leaves college; but this is the end of their general education, which is "prescribed" from beginning to end. They then go up to the university, and their professional education begins at once, for the Dutch university corresponds entirely to the graduate school of an American university, and there is nothing which corresponds with the college. Thus the professional career of a man in England begins after he has taken his

university degree; on the Continent, when he leaves school.

If we now turn to professional education and take up the career of the man who is going to be a minister, the difference entailed by the variations between the English and the Dutch systems becomes apparent. The English student can stay on if he likes at the university and study theology. Neither in Oxford nor in Cambridge is this a particularly good form of training, but it is the best there is. Ecclesiastical interests have effectually toned down, even where they have not entirely suppressed, anything resembling scientific study of theology, and great scholars who are not Anglicans are debarred from professorial chairs, and, in Oxford even from degrees in divinity. The man who has already spent four years at the university crowds his theology into one extra year and is taught rapidly the solution of problems the real nature of which has never been properly stated to him. Moreover, inadequate though this system is, it is still feared as too radical, and there is a general tendency on the part of ecclesiastical advisers to urge men not to study theology at the universities, on the ground that it is liable to destroy faith. The result is that most men who are entering the ministry of the English Church go to some of the numerous theological schools scattered about England under the control of the bishops. The teaching in these schools is frankly denominational and unscientific. It could, indeed, scarcely be worse. Third-rate theology is taught by second-rate men to ill-educated hearers, and pupils and teachers between them achieve a certainty of statement which is in inverse ratio to their understanding of the facts. I was myself at Cuddesdon, which is one of the best of these schools. I had a very pleasant time there, but the teaching was bad, and when I sought for advice on difficult points I was warned against pride and urged to go to confession.

The situation in Holland is entirely different. The professors are appointed by the state and own allegiance to no denomination. But the Dutch Church is wise enough to refuse the entrance to its ministry to men who have not studied theology at one of the State universities. The ordinary career lasts three years, and includes Greek, Hebrew, the study of heathen religions, the Old and New Testaments, Church history, and some philosophy. The State does not teach systematic theology, on the ground that if it is scientific it is indistinguishable from philosophy, and that if it is based on a special revelation its understanding has been intrusted to the Churches and cannot be expected from State professors. To fill up this gap the State allows each Church to appoint a professor of its own to give instruction in systematic theology and in any other subjects which they may think right. The implied suggestion that the State professors have no religion and the ecclesiastical professors no science has worked curiously. Each has been so anxious to show that the suggestion is false that they have sometimes reversed their positions, and students have been known to complain of the undue pietism of the State professor and of the fierce intellectualism of the representatives of the Church. The shortest period of instruction is four years—one of them in the State curriculum, and one with the professors of the Church. This makes a man a “Kandidaat”; but the best students do not stop here, although the examinations which come at the end of their third and fourth years entitle them to become ministers. Most of them go on and take a doctor’s degree, which usually requires at least two, and probably three, more years’ work. The standard of excellence reached by these doctors of theology naturally varies. There are many men who achieve the degree by a kind of intellectual brute force. The favorite method is known in some circles as “body-snatching,” for it is

said that the easiest way to a doctor's degree is to dig up a dead divine of the seventeenth century and write his life. This requires industry but little else. At the same time I think that this part of the Dutch theological education is probably the best. Its strength is that it introduces men not to codified knowledge but to "knowledge in the making," in a manner which is scarcely ever done in England. They learn to handle documents and to distrust books about books. Instead of going to lectures and listening to the more or less stereotyped lectures of the professors, they take their difficulties to the various members of the faculty and discuss general principles of work and thought.

If one now compares the American system with the English and the Dutch, it becomes plain how largely it is an attempt to combine the English and the Continental systems. American education started with the Latin School in Boston, and Harvard College was founded in imitation of the English University of Cambridge, just as the Latin School was the imitation or rather perpetuation of the grammar-school system of England. So far there was no difference in principle between the English and the American system; but in the nineteenth century Americans who had been in Europe tried to do for their own country what Berlin or Leipzig had done for Germany. But instead of reforming the whole system on a German model, they added on to the top of the existing colleges a superstructure of graduate schools. The result is that, whereas England has schools and colleges but no graduate schools worthy of the name and Germany or Holland has schools and universities which correspond in method and purpose to the graduate schools but has no colleges, America has the three institutions of schools, colleges, and graduate schools. It is perhaps worth noting that one result of this is that the age at which a boy goes to college in

America is considerably younger than that at which he generally goes to the University in Holland.

On the whole, I believe that the American system is the best of the three, or might become so if it were better worked. I intensely disliked the abrupt termination of general education which the student underwent in Holland, and I am sure that it is a good thing to bring men after they leave school into contact with scholars and to allow them to develop on freer lines than is possible in a school. The weak points seem to me to be the inferior education given in the schools and the disastrous effect of the course system in college. But these are defects of which every one is aware and they are sure to disappear in time. The system of final examinations already introduced at Harvard in the Divinity School and in the History Department is a move in the right direction which has already justified itself in the eyes of those who have seen it in working.

To summarize then the whole, it may be said that the English method sends out men who have received a higher degree of general culture; the Dutch system is preëminent in the teaching of scientific theology; the American comes half-way between the two, though it approximates more closely to the Dutch standard than to the English. Perhaps I may make explicit what I mean by saying that the Dutch student who leaves off as a "Kandidaat" is as a rule better equipped with general theological knowledge than the Bachelor of Theology of the Harvard Divinity School. But the Doctor of Theology of Harvard is at least as good as, and, on his own subject, probably better than the Doctor of Theology at Leiden. Both Dutch and American are incomparably better than the English product so far as scientific theology is concerned, though the average of general culture and power of expression is higher with the English system than with either the Dutch or the American, and for the

general efficiency of the clergy this is a large compensation for their intellectual handicap.

The important point is, however, that though the American and Dutch systems are successful in making scientific students and teachers, they are no better than the English for the successful making of ministers. This is not to praise the English system. For the great problem of theological education today is that none of us is succeeding in making ministers who can maintain the influence of the Churches as they ought. Both in England and in Holland the general complaint is made that the Liberal ministers are unsuccessful in holding their congregations. In Holland the successful minister, with very few exceptions, belongs to a reactionary form of Calvinism, in England to a bastard Catholicism. Neither type is liberal in its intellectual position nor is in the least likely to be influenced by scientific theology, which it regards as the invention of the Evil One. Outside of their ranks there are, it is true, many Liberal clergy in England and there are even more in Holland, but they are not gaining in strength and they are not keeping their Churches even moderately full. Now these men are the products of the theological schools in Holland; and in England, so far as the teaching of theology in the universities by men like Sanday and Burkitt has had any effect at all, it has been on the production of the Liberal clergy. Therefore to say that they are failing is to indict the whole system of the professional training of ministers.

I would not claim to be certain what the reason is and I should deprecate any revolutionary suggestions; but in the belief that the situation in America, though not so bad, presents already some disquieting symptoms and is likely to present more, I propose to venture on a few criticisms. Our present system is based on the inherited belief that the most important thing for a minister is to be able to expound Christian theology. But congre-

gations as a whole have settled down in Liberal Churches to the conviction, firmly held though not always very clearly expressed, that, though they wish to retain what they regard as the Christian religion, they do not think that the Christian theology is necessary to salvation or, indeed, always acceptable to the intelligent. This does not mean that they do not desire a rational and intelligible discussion of the problems of religion; on the contrary, there are few things which are more desired by most men and many women, and the clergy err grievously in so seldom recognizing this fact. But it does mean, in the first place, that they reject, partly as untrue, partly as unintelligible, traditional theology, and, in the second place, that they ask for light and leading on the difficult problems of conduct presented by modern life. The demand is primarily, though not exclusively, for ethical rather than metaphysical thought.

Let me put the same matter a little differently. In the time of our forefathers men believed that there was a definite and infallible gospel. If a man believed this gospel and lived in accordance with it, he would secure his salvation in the next world. This gospel was not the discovery of any human being but was the direct revelation of God to man, who could not have known anything about it if he had not been divinely instructed. The minister was the minister of the gospel because he knew accurately this divine message and could expound it correctly. Under these circumstances the minister always had something to say, could speak from a position of advantage, and his congregation had adequate reason for listening to him. It was important for both sides that the Bible and the theology based upon it should be adequately learned and taught, because it was necessary to the salvation of a man's soul.

With the coming of the Liberal movements this whole edifice has been destroyed. Liberal theologians con-

tinue to speak of theology, but in point of fact they no longer believe in any theology based on a special revelation, and they retain the use of the word "revelation" only by using it in a sense which would have been abhorrent to the theologians of the past. So far as I have been able to see, no modern Liberal theologian bases his position on anything except the facts of experience by the individual and the race, interpreted in the light of reason, and not as a supernatural revelation, although some of them achieve a verbal reconciliation between this view and traditional phraseology by saying that this experience *is* a supernatural revelation.

I do not see that this kind of theology really differs from philosophy. It is, in fact, merely a subdivision of philosophy which tries to coördinate the phenomena of religion with the rest of life. There can be no philosophy worthy of the name which does not do this, and the philosophers of other times occupied themselves with its problems just as much as do our theologians. But in those days the philosopher and the theologian were distinguished from one another because the theologian dealt with facts which had been communicated, as no other facts had been, by divine revelation and had not been discovered by reason or research. We have given up that which distinguished theology in the past from philosophy, and I am not sure that we have any right to use the word for our modern systems.

Whether it be called theology or philosophy, it is a mistake, I think, to suppose that because men no longer think that salvation depends on theology they are therefore not interested in philosophic teaching. I feel sure that the man in the pew is interested in it and expects to hear something about it. Unfortunately both in Holland and in England clerical opinion does not recognize this fact, and the young minister is constantly warned not to preach theology. Terrible stories are told of

men who emptied their churches by preaching sermons on the *Communicatio Idiomatum*. No doubt the church was emptied, but the reason was not because the man preached theology but because he spoke a jargon unknown to his congregation and probably unintelligible to himself. Philosophy or theology deals with ultimates, with the first and last things of human thought. It is desirable that all ministers should know and should understand the history of thought on these points, but it is also desirable that they should speak about them in simple language in a way which an ordinary man can understand and that they should know the meaning of the words which they use.

We are not so badly off in America in this respect, or rather we suffer from a different complaint. So many ministers and, still more, so many theological students, seem to have new systems of theology which may possess many "inspirational" merits but have not that of logic. I am convinced that there are few things which are more needed in all the Churches in this country than that the theological schools should train up a generation of preachers who would be more, rather than less, "theological," but would recognize that the repetition of a phrase in a wrong sense does not supply an argument, and that the rapid circulation of words can never be a substitute for reason. Perhaps I may venture to express the belief that the Harvard Divinity School is doing few things of greater value at the present time than forcing students in theology to explain the phrases which they make use of at oral examinations. Nothing would induce me to submit to the process myself, but I have been present at it often enough to realize its educative value. We need better philosophy or theology, not less.

Nevertheless, however we may prize intelligible theology, no one now makes the claim in the old sense that it is necessary for the salvation of a single soul, even of

his own, that his system of theology should be believed or even understood. Express it how we may, nearly all of us have come to think of salvation, if we use the term at all, as meaning progress in the right direction rather than the attainment of a final destination, and believe that progress depends, not on the acceptance of any given formula, but on the right use by men, whether as individuals or as a society, of all their faculties, physical, intellectual, and moral.

Therefore what the minister is required to do is to help men to use these faculties in the right way, and the use of faculties depends almost entirely upon circumstances. It is not very difficult to lay down abstract rules about right and wrong, but it is extremely hard to decide what is right or wrong under a given set of circumstances. It therefore follows that no man can be an effective minister unless he is able to stand out as preëminent for his knowledge of the circumstances of life, as the ministers of the past were for their knowledge of theology. No one can teach usefully on the moral issues of modern life if he does not know what the circumstances of modern life really are. But this raises the question whether it is possible to raise up a class of men whose occupation from the beginning is to study the circumstances of life in relation to their moral issues and to talk about them without being professionally engaged in them. Is it not probable that it will more and more obviously pass the powers of any human being fully to understand all the complicated circumstances of modern life, and especially the problems provided by occupations in which he is not professionally engaged? Personally I admit that I am far more stimulated by hearing a lawyer discuss the moral problems of law and a business man discuss the problems of business than I am by hearing the most gifted pulpit orator discussing the same subjects. I admit that in one way the pulpit orator generally has the advantage. He is able to use

a larger vocabulary with greater artistic effect and to make the whole problem appear easy. Some preachers are so gifted in this respect that they seem able to solve all modern problems by the magic touch of the homiletic art. After hearing them one feels that the problem of capital and labor can be solved by the application of a text from St. Paul; it is a shock to find that the representatives of capital in the congregation do not share this hope. Such preaching does not represent the best Christian tradition, least of all in New England; it is more akin to Dio Chrysostom. But it is unfair to blame the preachers. The truth is that modern life is too complex for one man to understand it all, and therefore I rather doubt whether it will be possible by any conceivable method of education to train up men to talk hebdomadally on all the moral problems of present-day life. I believe that the Churches would be well advised to invite prominent professional members of their congregations into the pulpit in order to obtain the statements on the moral issues of modern life of men who know by experience where the difficulties really are.

But preaching or teaching is not everything; there is another side to the professional work of a minister. The great strength of the Roman Catholic Church is that it makes an effort to deal with those who are spiritually sick in the only way in which sickness can be dealt with successfully—by taking each case separately as an individual problem. I do not mean to suggest that the Catholic method of the confessional is desirable or that the theory of sin and absolution with which it is bound up is capable of intelligent defense, but merely that it gives the Catholic the enormous advantage of taking each case of spiritual sickness separately, while the Protestant tries to deal with all cases *en masse* in the pulpit. For in any case the treatment of these cases must be one of the true concerns of any Christian Church, and

neither in England, in Holland, nor in America is there any sufficient attempt made to teach men how to fulfil these duties, which are becoming far better understood by doctors, lawyers, and social workers than they are by ministers.

Exactly how instruction in this matter ought to be given I do not know; but I can see plainly that the lecture room is not the right place, even though a university ought to undertake its organization. It seems to me that we ought to follow the example of doctors. The medical profession gives some of its instruction in the lecture room; but the most important part of it is given in the wards of a hospital. To my mind the most complete analogue to the wards of a hospital is the prison and the penitentiary. It is to those places that spiritual sickness, when long enough neglected, inevitably comes, just as disease in the last resource comes to the surgeon. But the medical student is taught by the surgeon how in many cases this tragedy might have been prevented or mitigated, and men are urged to consult doctors in order to prevent the spread of disease. Would it not be possible for the future minister to be educated on some such lines as the doctor? Show to him and let him study the worst cases of spiritual disease, in order that he may recognize the symptoms and know the remedy before it has gone so far in other cases. The work need not be confined to prisons or penitentiaries, for every parish provides some analogues to those who are under medical treatment, and every minister has experience of those who are spiritually sick. But to do this theological schools need the coöperation of ministers. At the present time, from the point of view of education, many of our students are wasting their time and forming bad intellectual habits by "supplying" pulpits while they are still at the School. The only excuse for the practice is that they need the money; but this is no justification.

They ought rather to be attached to large and flourishing churches not as a means of adding to their incomes but as part of their education. It is true that they would often be more hindrance than help to the ministers of the parishes to which they went; but our alumni are very loyal, and we count on their help. Just as practising physicians and surgeons constantly give up some of their time to teaching in the hospitals in our great medical centres, ought we not to demand from our older ministers that they should contribute to our teaching and allow our students to come and learn from them some of the practical problems which have to be faced by those who are the physicians of souls?

PROFESSOR C. C. TORREY ON THE *ACTS*

F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Dr. Torrey has produced a work¹ which, though contained in a little treatise of seventy-two pages, may well be an epoch-making contribution to our knowledge of Acts. He has undertaken to demonstrate two things: first, that Acts 1-15 35 is directly traceable to an Aramaic source which Luke translated; secondly, that the rest of the book is the work of one author.

This implies that we must revise all our previous ideas of the date not only of Acts, but of the written synoptic tradition. We must give up all theories of "sources," all ideas that Acts is in any sense a *Tendenz-Schrift*, and must subscribe to the orthodox assertion that Acts was completed by A.D. 64, and that Luke when he wrote was ignorant of what had happened to Paul after his two years' captivity at Rome. We must, naturally, acknowledge that Luke owes nothing to Josephus; on the contrary, if there was any borrowing, Josephus, who wrote his *Antiquities* at least thirty years after the Acts, was indebted to Luke. We must further postulate that the story of Acts 1-15 existed in its present form in an Aramaic document as early as A.D. 50, and that to Luke it was so important—I had almost said so sacred—that he did not presume to alter a word when he made his literal translation. Such are the consequences of Dr. Torrey's theory which we now proceed to examine.

Dr. Torrey's method is thoroughly sound. He may deduce more than his investigations warrant; but when

¹ The Composition and Date of the Acts. Harvard Theological Studies, No. 1. Harvard University Press, 1916.

he subjects a Greek verse or phrase to criticism he does not do so without good reason, and his knowledge of Aramaic is such that few could presume to call it in question.

The three chapters are entitled:

- I. The Aramaic Source of Acts.
- II. The Integrity of the Second Half of Acts.
- III. The Relation of II Acts and I Acts.

In chapter 1 Dr. Torrey shows why, in his opinion, in "the first fifteen chapters the language is translation-Greek." He begins by collecting a formidable array of Semitisms extending over the chapters from 1 1 to 15 23. He declares that these idioms are specifically not Hebrew but obviously Aramaic. He admits that some of them are traceable in the later parts of Acts, but urges that these are probably part of the Koinè language, which is obviously being used. Acts 1-15 35 ff. does not sound like the Koinè. It is translation-language, like 1 Maccabees, etc., and it cannot be that Luke is trying to write in the style of the LXX, for Acts 15 36-28 *fin.* is not at all in this style. Dr. Torrey is of opinion that Acts 1-15 35 was in Palestinian Aramaic, the language of Judæa as compared with the northern Aramaic dialect. He admits that we do not know much of this Palestinian variety; but he endeavors to use it as the basis of re-translation, taking as his models the fragments we have, the Targum of Onkelos, and the documents preserved in the Hebrew Ezra, etc.

Here are a few passages which are taken to prove the Aramaic origin of chapters 1-15 35:

Acts 2 47: ὁ δὲ Κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. The last three words are usually taken as "together" or "in the same place." In Biblical Hebrew they would be equivalent to יחד. This makes sense in Luke 17 35, Acts 1 15, 4 26; cf. Ps. 2 2. But it does not make sense here. In the Textus Receptus and the A. V. an attempt

is made to get rid of the difficulty by connecting it with 3 1. Cod. D has ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. But retranslation into the Palestinian dialect explains it all; לַחֲדָא in it means "greatly." Thus the literal translation would be, "The Lord added to those that are saved daily greatly," that is, the number of converts rapidly increased; but Luke's ignorance of Palestinian Aramaic made him translate לַחֲדָא as if it were יְחַדֵּי.

Acts 3 16: Καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, τοῦτον δὲ θεωρεῖτε καὶ οἴδατε, ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ · καὶ ἡ πίστις ἣ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν ταύτην ἀπέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν. Here we have a very clumsily worded passage; note the ugly repetition of ὄνομα. Dr. Torrey's explanation is extremely ingenious: Luke read the Aramaic תְּקַן שְׁמֵהּ ἔστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ instead of תְּקַן שְׁמֵהּ "made him whole." The verse would then read consistently and intelligibly, "Yea, the faith which is through Him hath given him this soundness."

Acts 4 25: The prayer of the disciples, containing the hopelessly unintelligible words ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδὸς σου εἰπών. No scholar has ever made sense of this jumble of words. But in Aramaic they would be אָמַר הוּא דִּי אַבְנָא לְפִי רֹחָא דִּי קוֹדְשָׁא דִּי עַבְדְּךָ דְּדָוִד הוּא. The rendering of the feminine הוּא ought to be, "That which our father David, thy servant, said by the mouth of the Holy Spirit." The manner of Luke in sticking close to a difficult Aramaic text is, according to Dr. Torrey, characteristic of this writer as a translator.

Somewhat less convincing is the treatment of

Acts 8 10: οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη. How are we to account for the presence of καλουμένη? True, Gnostic formulæ speak of a μεγάλη δύναμις. "But this," says Dr. Torrey, "is quite outside the atmosphere of the book of Acts; nor have we any reason for supposing that

the people of Samaria were a Gnostic community." Klostermann thinks that may be a transliteration of מְלִיחָה, "revealing." The main difficulty, however, says Dr. Torrey, lies in τοῦ θεοῦ. He reminds us that Samaria was not Samaritan. As Wellhausen says, "The city of Samaria remained heathen and did not belong to the Samaritan community." Philip therefore was preaching in a town where people believed in gods many and lords many. "What deity could the people of Sebaste have designated ὁ θεός?" I confess I do not see the force of these objections, and before showing how Dr. Torrey answers them, I should like to ask if they really present a difficulty. Καλουμένη occurs in Acts 9 11: τὴν ῥύμην τὴν καλουμένην εὐθεΐαν, and we have the θύρα λεγούνη ὥραια (3 2). It is also quite possible that in Samaria there was a Gnostic community, especially if Sebaste, which, as Wellhausen says, *blieb heidnisch*, is the scene of Philip's meeting with Simon. But we cannot argue both ways at once; either Sebaste is meant by τὴν πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρίας or it is not. In the former case a Gnostic community is possible; in the latter ὁ θεός presents no difficulty. I venture to think the whole context is against the implication that Philip preached in a heathen city. A mission to heathen at this stage is inconceivable. Simon is not said in Acts to have amazed the Gentiles, whatever he may have done later, but τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρίας. The Apostles hear that Samaria has received the word (14). After the discomfiture of Simon they evangelize πολλὰς κώμας τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν. The Samaritans meant are clearly the schismatical nation which practised the law of Moses. Otherwise the necessity of Peter needing a vision before he could go to the uncircumcised Cornelius is pointless, and a serious objection to the unity of these chapters, for which Dr. Torrey contends so earnestly, is provided.

But I must turn from the delightful task of showing a slight blemish in the argument of a friend and colleague

to return to a field where I can offer no criticism. The verse rendered into Aramaic would read as follows: **רַב דִּין חֵילָא דִּי אֱלֹהָא דִּי מְתַקְרָא רַב** which Dr. Torrey admits to be ambiguous, for, **רַב** being masculine, it may be rendered *αὐτῇ*, "this;" *οὗτός* is also possible: "This man is the power of God τοῦ καλουμένου μεγάλου." "The Great God" is, of course, the God of the Jews. "In early Syriac 'Rabbā' is occasionally used absolutely as his title."

We now come to a passage which Dr. Torrey considers "one of the most satisfactory of all in the proof of translation which it affords." In 11 28 the famine foretold by Agabus was to be ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην. Cf. Luke 11 1, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. In both cases οἰκουμένη means the whole Roman empire; and neither the famine nor the enrolment affected, so far as we know, more than Palestine. In an Aramaic document we should have **כל ארעא**. This a translator would naturally render by οἰκουμένη, "all the earth." But why should Luke not have used ἡ γῆ if he had supposed the famine to be confined to Palestine and not to be universal?

To these passages Dr. Torrey adds other evidence, some of which is as cogent as any hitherto adduced, and I must reluctantly content myself with selecting only a few specimens.

(1) Acts 14: The difficult word *συναλιζόμενος* is the exact rendering of **מְתַמְלָח** an Ithpa'al, meaning to eat salt in company with. The Pe'al is found in Ezra 4 14. This verb is used in the Harklean Syriac. The Ithpa'al is only known to us in the Northern Syriac dialect.

(2) The employment of the words *ῥεατο* (1 1), *ἀρξάμενος* (1 22, Luke 23 5, Acts 10 37). Of this Dr. Torrey says, "We see exemplified in a very striking way Luke's cautious faithfulness leading him to the employment of translation-Greek of the stiffest type."

(3) 2 24: *ὠδῖνες θανάτου*. Luke uses *λύσας* in connection with this. It is a most unsuitable word; but in Ps. 17 5, 145 3, *ὠδῖνες* is used to translate *חֲבִלִּי*, "bands of." Thus Luke must have had an Aramaic document with *חֲבִלִּי*.

(4) 10 36 f.: This is a specially striking passage. In the first place, it occurs in a chapter which many pronounce to be a free Lukan composition, and it also has a very great theological significance. *Διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ οὗτός ἐστι πάντων Κύριος* is a very strong expression for that age, and especially for Palestine. It would even have needed qualification at a much later date, for it appears to make Jesus Christ equal to the Father. Dr. Torrey suggests that *οὗτος* is not Jesus, but is the Aramaic *הוּא*, "this," and that it is the subject of the verb "sent": "As for the word which this Lord of all sent to the children of Israel, etc."

It is noteworthy that some examples of translation-Greek in the section Acts 13–15 35 are taken from the 13th chapter: verses 1, *τὴν οὔσαν ἐκκλησίαν*; 22, 24, 25 (*ter*). The last three are from the sermon at Pisidian Antioch. In chapter 14 there are only two examples: verse 17 (*ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς καὶ εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν*), and verse 27—the use of *μετά*, which occurs also in 15 4, in the sense of *עִם*, a preposition commonly connected with *עִבֵּר*, meaning "to do to" anyone. I consider the place of these alleged Aramaisms significant. Taking into account Luke's use of *οὔσα* and also that of Paul, it is difficult to consider its use in Acts 13 1 important; nor do I think that much weight attaches to those in chapter 14. There remains therefore only the Sermon, of which an Aramaic report may have been preserved.

Only the first thirty-five verses of chapter 15 come under discussion, as the second section of Acts commences with 15 36. All the Aramaisms are taken between 15 16 and 23—the relation of the speeches and events of

the Apostolic council, which may have been in Aramaic. The suggestion which Professor G. F. Moore has given Dr. Torrey of the difficult phrase *τούτων τῶν ἐπιαναγκες* (15 28) is interesting. He thinks the *τῶν* may be due to a dittography, and that a stop should be placed after *τούτων*. Then we should read, "to lay upon you no further burthen, except these: *ἐπιαναγκες ἀπεχέσθαι ἐιδωλοθύτων*."

Such then is Dr. Torrey's argument. It is, as all will admit, very suggestive, and is packed with valuable helps to exegesis. That of 2 47 seems to me most ingenious. By his extensive knowledge of Aramaic dialects he has succeeded in explaining a very difficult phrase in a simple and probable manner, and the conclusion that an Aramaic original is at the back of this and other strange expressions is too strong for me to deny. But this is only part of Dr. Torrey's task, which is to demonstrate satisfactorily the absolute unity of the Aramaic document, which an author like Luke, whom he admits possessed great literary versatility, translated with such conscientious fidelity that he preserved its very errors, even those which must have been obvious to him.

The second chapter of our treatise must receive less attention than it deserves. In it Dr. Torrey points out the marked difference in the style from that of 1-15 35, the change in the Christology, and the impossibility of the Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15 having been so described by a companion of Paul's. But does not Dr. Torrey ignore the difficulty of accounting for a close friend of Paul's having incorporated into his narrative so damaging a statement as that relating to the proceedings of the Apostles and the promulgation of the letter to the churches of Syria and Cilicia? The main part of the chapter is, however, devoted to showing that Harnack's view, that 27 9-11 is by a later hand, cannot be maintained, and to exposing the fallacy of Norden's theory of Paul's Areopagus speech in Acts 17. It is to

be regretted that he does not deal with a far more serious objection, that of the integrity of the last part of Acts—the problem of reconciling Acts 28 17 *ad fin.* with all that is elsewhere known of Paul's attitude towards the Jewish leaders. How could a disciple of Paul who knew of the Epistles to the Romans, make the Jewish elders of Rome ignorant not only of his existence but of that of the Christian sect?

The third chapter — the relation of II Acts to I Acts — deals with three points: (1) Old Testament quotation and language in Acts; (2) the homogeneity of the Aramaic document; (3) the probable date of Acts.

In dealing with the first, Dr. Torrey points out that while there are, according to Westcott and Hort 94, and according to Nestle 83 quotations from the Old Testament in I Acts, there are only 4 in II Acts. From this he infers that Luke knew very little about the Old Testament till later in life, and its words and phrases did not come readily to his pen. It is open to inquiry whether the theme of II Acts lent itself to Old Testament quotation; and whether Acts 26 — the speech of Agrippa — is one on which the conclusion that I Acts is translation-Greek and II Acts free composition can be maintained. Agrippa, it is true, was a Jew and an observer of the law; but would a speech like the sermon at Pisidian Antioch have been suitable? The sermon was suitable to a synagogue and the speech to a law court in the presence of a Roman procurator and a Hellenized Hebrew king.

Before conceding the homogeneity of the Aramaic document, it would be necessary to enter very minutely into questions of sources, and to discuss Harnack's theory of Acts 2 being a β source while Acts 3 and 4 is an α one, both referring to the same event, not to mention other examples of doublets and inconsistencies. In this section, however, Dr. Torrey has, I think, proved his

thesis "that there is no introductory paragraph, though we are led to expect one." The opening sentence, τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὦ Θεοφιλε, has no ending; and Luke, after writing these words, began to translate his Aramaic document, which began thus: "After (בְּתָר) all that Jesus did and taught, up to the day when he gave commandment to the Apostles whom he had chosen by the Holy Spirit, and was taken up; to whom, etc."

When the main contentions of Dr. Torrey are conceded — namely, that I Acts and II Acts are each single homogeneous documents, combined together by Luke, the companion of Paul — the rest follows as a matter of course. I Acts must be a very early document, and Luke may have completed it after making his translation by adding his own experiences when a fellow traveller of Paul. The objections are familiar ones but to us of secondary interest. They are (a) that the Third Gospel was written after A.D. 70. Dr. Torrey shows that Luke 21 is a tissue of Old Testament quotations and thinks that it may well be prophetic; (b) Luke's indebtedness to Josephus, of which Dr. Torrey admits but two "correspondences" worthy of serious attention — Acts 5 36, cf. Jos. *Antiq.* XX, 5, 1; and Luke 3 1, cf. *Antiq.* XX, 7, 1 (Lysanias). His discussion of them is fair and ingenious, but it requires much more than the two pages or so which is all that is devoted to it.

It will take many judgments before a final decision can be given as to Dr. Torrey's case being proved. Mine is at best that of a judge of a court of first instance. That there were Aramaic sources for I Acts I feel convinced by the arguments presented to us. That nothing but Aramaic sources were used is, I consider, "not proven." That there was only one document appears to me extremely doubtful. That Luke translated this with meticulous accuracy, adding nothing of importance of his

own and adapting nothing to prove those points which he desired to establish, is, judging by his use of Mark and Q, to me at least incredible. I admit that there is a marked difference between the Greek of 1-12 and 16 36 *ad fin.*; but I am not so certain about 13-14, 15 1-35, except in some definite sections. I am, however, convinced that it is impossible to say with any degree of positiveness that Luke, the companion of Paul, was the final redactor of Acts, or that Acts, as we have it, comes from a Pauline source. My judgment may be reversed with my full but regretful consent when the case comes before judges of a higher court, the Supreme Court of New Testament scholars. But they will not reverse my final pronouncement that Dr. Torrey has done a great service to scholarship by promulgating his theory; and "right or wrong," he deserves the thanks of the learned world.

THE ANONYMOUS HYMNS OF SAMUEL LONGFELLOW

HENRY WILDER FOOTE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

On February 27, 1917, I had occasion to spend some hours in the library of Union Theological Seminary in New York, looking over the admirable collection of hymnody on the Seminary's shelves. As I came to the collection of Unitarian hymn-books I opened by chance a copy of the *Unitarian Hymn and Tune Book* (1877), when a letter fell from the volume. Picking it up I recognized the handwriting of Samuel Longfellow and saw that the letter had to do with certain of his hymns. It ran as follows:

"GERMANTOWN [Pa.] Nov. 18 [1880].

DEAR SIR:—

I have known of your interest in Hymnology and am glad to come into communication with you.

'Flung to the heedless winds' is certainly not my version. I do not know whose it is, nor why Dr. Martineau sh^d have attributed it to me (as he did Dr. Hedge's version of Luther's 'Ein feste Burg'). I am pretty sure that it was copied into the *B. of Hymns* from the Cheshire Collection. Perhaps President Livermore of Meadville could tell you about it. I have a collection of Luther's Hymns in German. There is only one of them which bears any resemblance to this, and that only in one verse. It is a very long Hymn, a sort of ballad about two young men put to death at Strasburg for their protestantism. If the H. in question be taken from that, as I suppose, it is a very free paraphrase.

Of the *Anons* in the *H. of the Spirit* a good many are hymns so much changed as not to be honestly attributed to anybody. Others were of authorship really unknown to us at the time, though since discovered, as in Martineau's new book. I should be glad to know

of any whose author you have found, if not in his book. I may say that Hymns 585 and 330 are mine. I did not put my name because two lines in the former and one line in the latter were not mine. 550 founded on a H. of Wesley is nearly all mine. 127 and 368 are mine but are of no importance.

Can you tell me anything of a 'Hymn of the Calabrian peasants,' upon wh. 60 (*H. of Sp.*) is founded. I tho't it was by Mrs. Hemans, but cannot find it in her volumes.

I will try to look up some dates. The only thing to add to my biography w^d be my settlement in Germantⁿ in 1878.

Very Truly,

SAM^l LONGFELLOW.

438 (*H. of Sp.*) I versified from a passage in one of Martineau's sermons."

The letter was so folded that the signature and this postscript first met my eye. As I glanced at the latter the thought flashed across me that here was a clue to the authorship of the hymn beginning,

"He who himself and God would know."

That hymn has not infrequently been assigned to Dr. James Martineau, being obviously based upon a passage from one of his sermons.¹ It does not appear, however, in any one of Dr. Martineau's three collections, nor was it ever acknowledged by him, so that it has generally

¹ It may be interesting to compare the hymn with the passage. Martineau writes:

"Let any true man go into silence; strip himself of all pretence and selfishness and sensuality and sluggishness of soul; lift off thought after thought, passion after passion, till he reaches the inmost depth of all; remember how short a time, and he was not at all; how short a time again, and he will not be here; open his window and look upon the night, how still its breath, how solemn its march, how deep its perspective, how ancient its forms of light; and think how little he knows except the perpetuity of God, and the mysteriousness of life—and it will be strange if he does not feel the Eternal Presence as close upon his soul, as the breeze upon his brow; if he does not say, 'O Lord, art Thou ever near as this, and have I not known thee?' if the true proportions and the genuine spirit of life do not open on his heart with infinite clearness, and show him the littleness of his temptations and the grandeur of his trust. He is ashamed to have found weariness in toil so light, and tears where there was no trial to the brave. He discovers with astonishment how small the dust that has blinded him, and from the height of a quiet and holy love looks down with incredulous sorrow on the jealousies and fears and irritations that have vexed his life. A mighty wind of resolution sets

been printed as anonymous. It was evident that the hymn-numbers in Mr. Longfellow's letter did not refer to the volume from which the letter had slipped, so I ran my eye along the shelf until it lighted upon *Hymns of the Spirit*, the notable collection by Samuel Longfellow and Samuel Johnson, published in 1864. I turned eagerly to number 438. It was indeed,

"He who himself and God would know,"

and against it was a pencilled note, "S. Longfellow from Martineau's sermons." In the index it was entered simply as "From Martineau." This was a most interesting discovery. I turned next to the other hymns to which Mr. Longfellow referred in his letter, and found entered against each the information which he had given about them. Folded into the volume was also a post-

in strong upon him and freshens the whole atmosphere of his soul; sweeping down before it the light flakes of difficulty, till they vanish like snow upon the sea. He is imprisoned no more in a small compartment of time, but belongs to an eternity which is now and here. The isolation of his separate spirit passes away; and with the countless multitude of souls akin to God, he is but as a wave of His unbounded deep. He is at one with Heaven, and hath found the secret place of the Almighty."

"Endeavors After the Christian Life."
Sermon 17, "Silence and Meditation."

Longfellow's versification runs:

"He who himself and God would know,
Into the silence let him go,
And, lifting off pall after pall,
Reach to the inmost depth of all.

"Let him look forth into the night;
What solemn depths, what silent might!
Those ancient stars, how calm they roll—
He but an atom 'mid the whole.

"And, as the evening wind sweeps by,
He needs must feel his God as nigh;
Must needs that unseen Presence own,
Thus always near, too long unknown.

"How small, in that uplifted hour,
Temptation's lure and passion's power!
How weak the foe that made him fall,
How strong the soul to conquer all!

"A mighty wind of nobler will
Sends through his soul its quickening thrill;
No more a creature of the clod,
He knows himself a child of God."

card from Mr. Longfellow, addressed to Rev. F. M. Bird, of Lehigh University, a well known hymnologist, one of the contributors to Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*. Evidently the letter had also been addressed to him and had been slipped into another volume by mistake, after Mr. Bird had made his annotations. Mr. Bird's hymn-books were, apparently, later bought by Mr. Henry Day, another collector of the last century, from whom they had come to Union Seminary.

The little volume with its annotations has, upon further study, provided additional facts of interest regarding Mr. Longfellow's hymns, especially when compared with his *Hymns and Verses* published in 1894, after his death (1892). The preface of that collection, written by his niece Miss Alice Longfellow, speaks of *Hymns of the Spirit* as containing "twenty-two original hymns by Mr. Longfellow, but three of these are marked anonymous in the index, as Mr. Longfellow wished to avoid the appearance of introducing too much of himself into the book. The hymn 'Holy Spirit, Truth divine' bears some resemblance to one of Andrew Reed's hymns, but after careful investigation proves to be quite distinct from it." Comparing the annotated copy of *Hymns of the Spirit* with the collection of *Hymns and Verses* I found that the former contained not twenty-two but twenty-three of Mr. Longfellow's hymns later included in *Hymns and Verses*, namely the nineteen which are ascribed to him in the index, including "Holy Spirit, Truth divine," and four others, set down as anonymous, namely:

- 127. "Father, give thy benediction."
- 330. "God of the earth, the sky, the sea."
- 485. "I look to thee in every need."
- 676. "God's trumpet wakes the slumbering world."

But Mr. Longfellow's letter reveals four more hymns in *Hymns of the Spirit* to which he had some claim, but

which are not to be found in *Hymns and Verses*. They are as follows:

368. "O Father, fix this wavering will,"

to which he refers as "of no importance";

550. "God of truth! thy sons should be,"

to which he made no claim because it was founded upon a hymn of Wesley's, although "nearly all mine";

585. "Every bird that upward springs,"

which, writing in 1880, he says he did not claim because "two lines . . . were not mine," but which in the index of *Hymns of the Spirit* he assigned to Neale; and

438. "He who himself and God would know,"

the hymn versified from Martineau which he did not claim because he evidently felt that it belonged to Martineau rather than to himself, and which he therefore entered in the index as "From Martineau." *Hymns of the Spirit*, therefore, contained not twenty-two but twenty-seven hymns to the authorship of which he felt that he had some claim.

Mr. Longfellow's habit of rewriting hymns by earlier authors, or of appropriating a line or two upon which to build a fresh hymn, has made it peculiarly difficult to identify the hymns which are wholly his. He evidently desired scrupulously to refrain from claiming hymns which were not wholly from his own pen, but it is interesting to note that hymn 330 in *Hymns of the Spirit*,

"God of the earth, the sky, the sea,"

to which he did not put his name because two lines were not his, has been included as his in *Hymns and Verses*. It is much more surprising that he should have put his name in *Hymns of the Spirit* to the hymn

"Holy Spirit, Truth divine,"

for, in spite of Miss Alice Longfellow's disclaimer, it is extremely difficult to avoid the conviction that Mr. Longfellow's hymn was directly founded on the well-known hymn by Andrew Reed, published in 1817,

"Holy Ghost, with light divine."

The similarity of the two hymns does not, indeed, extend beyond the first two lines of the first stanza and the first line of each succeeding stanza, but though Mr. Longfellow completely rewrote the rest of the hymn, something of Reed's nevertheless remains in it. In some modern collections the hymn appears as a composite of Reed's and Longfellow's versions, while in the new *Congregational Hymnary*, published by the Congregational Society of England and Wales, 1916, Longfellow's version of the hymn appears with still further alterations, presumably by one of the editors of the *Hymnary*. Mr. Longfellow's letter to Mr. Bird also illustrates a curious trick which his memory played him in permitting him to claim that all but two lines of hymn number 585 in *Hymns of the Spirit* ("Every bird that upward springs") were his own. He made that statement in 1880, thirty-two years after he had adapted the hymn from Neale for the 1848 *Supplement* to the *Book of Hymns*. Now as a matter of fact the hymn consists of stanzas 4, 5, 6, and 7, of Neale's Hymn for St. Andrew's Day, included in his *Hymns for Children*, 1842. Of the sixteen lines in Longfellow's version nine are taken unchanged from Neale, six contain part of Neale's wording, and only one is wholly Longfellow's! No one, of course, at all acquainted with Mr. Longfellow's character would dream of accusing him of consciously claiming as his own the work of another. With the lapse of years his own contribution to the completed product had come to bulk larger than it really was; he had simply forgotten how much he was indebted to Neale. Miss Longfellow also mis-

takenly included in *Hymns and Verses*, as an anonymous hymn of her uncle's, another to which he never made any claim, namely the translation from the Paris *Breviary* beginning "Supreme Disposer of the heart." It is in reality the work of John Chandler, and in both the 1848 *Supplement* to the *Book of Hymns* and in *Hymns of the Spirit* (1864) is entered as "Breviary."

One other pencilled note in the Union Seminary copy of *Hymns of the Spirit* suggests a problem for which I have no answer. Number 485 is Longfellow's exquisite hymn,

"I look to Thee in every need,"

printed as "Anon.," though included as his in *Hymns and Verses*. But in the margin is pencilled "v. 1, T. H. Bayley alt." Who was Bayley, and did he write some verses from which Mr. Longfellow drew his inspiration for this hymn? Was that why Mr. Longfellow did not acknowledge it in *Hymns of the Spirit*?

With the identification of these hymns contributed anonymously by Mr. Longfellow to *Hymns of the Spirit* we probably have a complete list of everything in the way of hymns which he wrote. It is a satisfaction to the student of hymnody to be able thus to trace more conclusively the songs of the writer who has made what is probably a more precious contribution in song to the religious life of America than any other nineteenth-century writer.

BOOK REVIEWS

INTOLERANCE IN THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH, QUEEN OF ENGLAND. ARTHUR J. KLEIN. The Houghton Mifflin Co. 1917. Pp. xii, 218. \$2.00.

No higher praise can be given to this able historical study than to say that it recalls and ranks with Mr. Usher's *Reconstruction of the English Church*. That within a few years two works of such distinction, dealing with technical features of English Church history, should have come from America, augurs well for the mutual understanding which exists between the two nations already allied by blood and civilization, and now knit closer by coöperation in a common and sacred cause.

"Intolerance," says the author, "is essentially a social phenomenon based upon the group-conception of 'rightness'; and attention is called to the fact that

"there is also a field worth investigating in the groups of non-religious intolerance. A very interesting book, or series of books, even more useful than much that has been written about religious intolerance, might be compiled by some one who turned his attention to the intolerance of medicine, of law, and of etiquette" (pp. 2, 4).

There is, however, this difference between the religious and the secular field, that on the former the conception of a fixed deposit of faith, which can neither be taken from nor added to, lies to hand. Given this premiss, there is a logical though not an ethical or a positive case for intolerance; while, on the latter, the content of the science or usage in question is obviously a variable quantity; so that intolerance, even if, like loss, it is "common to the race," is an inconsistency. On both, there are undoubtedly points of view which, though they are not our own, we may reasonably wish to see represented, because, while their predominance might be mischievous, they have a value as counter-balancing forces in the sum of thought and things. Only so can we secure

"the ultimate triumph of that sounder principle of national unity which recognizes the element of *variety* in a harmonious whole — a principle which only the modern world has realized" (p. 190).

We shall fail to understand the Reformation unless we realize how widely mediæval Catholicism differed from modern. The Reformation synchronized with, and to a great extent occasioned, the transformation of Catholicism into Romanism—the words are used in a historical, not in a controversial sense. What is meant is that before Luther the Western Church stood for Western Christianity, and that since Luther it has stood for Latin or Roman. There is all the difference in the world between the two. *La tradizione son' io*, said Pius IX; and no one dared to dispute the oracle. Had Clement VII or Leo X advanced the pretension, the stones would have cried out. For the Papacy was not then, as it has since become, the centre and sum of Catholicism. An important school of canonists sat loose to it, and the Great Schism had been an object-lesson. It had shown that, whatever the Pope might be theologically—that was a question for theologians—the Church could dispense with him in fact. And to a Catholic of the sixteenth century the Royal Supremacy was not the flat heresy that it is to the modern Romanist. In the Middle Ages two supremacies, the Royal and the Papal, struggled in the Church's womb.

A strong king was master in his own house; a strong Pope disputed his mastery; in ordinary times a *modus vivendi* was arrived at. But Henry VIII, high-handed as he was, could not have carried the nation with him had the Supreme Headship of the sovereign been as novel in fact as it was in name. The Reformation did not effect a revolution; it dissolved a partnership. The Pope was excluded from the government of the Reformed, the civil power from that of the un-reformed, churches. The latter process was gradual, and remained incomplete till our own day.

One notable result of these controversies was the heightening of the theological temperature. Both among Catholics and Protestants fanaticism overflowed its bounds; in England, happily, less than elsewhere, owing to the political forces at work in the religious settlement. The features of the English Church which are most displeasing to bigots—her distrust of enthusiasm and of extremes, her non-committal policy, what has been called her "quiet worldliness"—are not of post-Reformation origin; they are a direct inheritance from the secularized and sectarian temper of the Mediæval Church.

The Elizabethan settlement of religion, like the Revolution settlement of the succession (1688), which in many respects it resembled, was precarious for more than a generation. In each case the permanence of the new order seemed uncertain, and to whichever

side men attached themselves, they kept a foot in the opposite camp. At Elizabeth's accession there was an energetic Protestant minority, whose numbers and zeal had been increased by its Marian persecution, and a small but equally energetic Catholic minority whose hopes centred in the Queen of Scots; but the great majority of the people stood between the two. They resembled the nations of whom we read that "they feared the Lord but served their graven images." They were neither convinced Catholics nor convinced Protestants, but both, or neither, or something between the two. They were not Papists; the Papacy bulked less in Pre- than in Post-Reformation Catholicism; and they disliked, as Englishmen to this day dislike, religious change. The controversies of the age did not interest them. "These be not matters for burning," was their phrase. Among the educated the Queen's attitude, which was that of a somewhat detached outsider, was common. "Gentlemen," says Selden, "have ever been more temperate in their religion than the common people, as having more reason — the others running in a hurry."

The daughter of Anne Boleyn could not afford to be a Papist; and the sheer wickedness of the Counter-Reformation shocked her. She refused to admit Bonner to her presence — a fact which goes far to discredit the attempt made by later writers to whitewash him; and when, after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, she and her court received the French envoy in mourning, there is no reason to question her abhorrence of that great crime. But she was a lukewarm Protestant. Temperamentally she had neither understanding nor sympathy with fanaticism; as a ruler, she detested sedition; and she believed, not without reason, that the more extreme forms of Protestantism stood for both. The formularies of the English Church were deliberately framed to include non-Papal Catholics. It was from circumstances, not from choice, that the Queen became the champion of the Protestant cause. Both she and the country were carried further and faster in this direction than she had either wished or intended, by the association of ideas which was not at first obvious, and by the course of events, which could not be foreseen. Henry VIII's Catholicism without the Pope had broken down in the clash of conflicting world-forces, and Europe fell into two hostile camps, in one or other of which men and nations had to take their stand.

In her first year she had to nominate twenty-five bishops. There were difficulties — legal, for many of the sees were not legally vacant, and moral, because the best men refused the position. The per-

secuting Marian bishops were out of the question. Men of the type of Bernard Gilpin, whom Mr. Gladstone used to quote as an illustration of the continuity of English religion — he had been ordained under Henry VIII, and remained undisturbed under Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth — held back. The more religious Protestants, unfortunately, scrupled at the ceremonies and habits which Calvin had allowed as *tolerabiles ineptiae*, and which it was necessary to retain from political motives. The government had to fall back upon lesser men. Parker and Jewel, who were the best of them and were chosen against their will, scarcely inspire enthusiasm; the greater number deserved the contempt in which they were generally held. They were exiles whom persecution had made persecutors; their principles were lax and their standards low. Some were openly scandalous. Sandys, Archbishop of York, was found *in flagrante delicto* with the wife of a tavern-keeper; Middleton, who was subsequently deprived for incontinence, was what has been euphemistically described as “a Christian with two wives”; Aylmer was “a brawler, greedy of filthy lucre”; Barlow, Parker’s consecrator, a bishop of *opera bouffe*. The epitaph on Mrs. Barlow, whose five daughters married respectively an Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Winchester, Hereford, Lincoln, and Lichfield, is worth quoting:

Hic Agathae tumulus; Barloi praesulis, inde
 Exulis, inde iterum praesulis uxor erat.
 Prole beata fuit: plena annis quinque suarum
 Praesulibus vidit, praesulis ipsa, datas.

One could not take such an episcopate seriously; it was a thing for a shrug or a sneer. No one knew this better than Elizabeth. Her support of the bishops was political; they were useful tools. Her opposition to Puritanism, as to Popery, was not religious. To suppose her zealous for episcopacy or for the liturgy is to misread her: a child of the Renaissance, she “cared for none of these things.” Her anti-Puritan policy was matter of hard, cold calculation. The Reformation had gone to the outside limit of safety; a little, a very little, more and the nation would have been estranged. Elizabeth was better aware of this than her advisers; of all our sovereigns she was the most purely English and gauged most accurately the English mind. It was not till the half-French Stuarts associated Puritanism with Parliamentary as opposed to personal government that Puritanism became temporarily popular. In the Queen’s time it was an eccentricity; and there was less patience then than now with

eccentricities, particularly when they were, or might easily become, sources of public danger. Had Elizabeth broken openly and completely with the old religious order, the unity of the nation would have been destroyed. Her necessarily tentative and conservative policy has had lasting consequences, and has left as its legacy not a few of the controversies which divide the Church of our own time.

The Catholic question was as urgent as the Puritan. Professor Klein's parallel between this problem and that presented by anarchism today is ingenious:

"Perhaps no closer comparison of the English governmental attitude towards Catholics can be made than with the attitude of established government towards anarchistic opinion in our own time. The attitude is distinctly one of suspicion and supervision, but also one of tolerance and abstinence from active interference, except when the expression of opinion becomes clearly destructive of existing institutions or manifests itself in acts of violence" (p. 50).

It is probable that this expresses the Queen's intention. It was certainly that of Bancroft. But circumstances were too much for both Queen and Bishop; on each side passion and prejudice ran too high. The English Catholics were divided into two sections. The verdict of the majority of them on the Reformation was, *Fieri non debuit; factum valet*. All they asked for was to stand outside. But there was a minority, small but restlessly energetic and backed by Spain and Rome, which, regarding Catholicism primarily as a polity, would be content with nothing short of its forcible restoration, and held all means to this end lawful — rebellion, assassination, the calling in of foreign armies, the subjection of their country to alien rule. The *Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen* showed the extent to which the highest authorities in the Church were committed to plots whose objects were treasonable and whose methods were murderous.¹ This was the case for the Penal Laws. Some such legislation, Lingard admits, was a necessity.² Like the Coercion Acts of a later day, they were a hateful necessity. All exceptional legislation is hateful. But there are circumstances under which it becomes imperative in self-defence.

The Government, whatever its intentions, failed to a greater extent than Professor Klein admits, to distinguish between the moderate or religious, and the extreme or political, Catholics. Cuthbert Mayne was a type of the first, Robert Parsons of the

¹ Edinburgh Review, October, 1883.

² History of England, viii, 150. Life, by Haile and Bonney, 27.

second; and Mayne suffered while Parsons went free. Bancroft's merit was that he made a real attempt at discrimination, and that he would have put the former class within the law. In this, for a bishop, he was greatly in advance of his time. Nor, if his immediate motive was political, is it unreasonable to see also in his action a higher statesmanship, an endeavor to make the better and more reasonable elements in Catholicism prevail. At some personal risk he intervened in the domestic dissensions of the Catholic body, supporting the secular clergy against the Jesuits and their creature the arch-priest Blackwell, and facilitating the appeal of the former to Rome. Could the question have been settled in England, it might have been brought to a satisfactory issue. But Rome was the key to the position; and Rome, as always, took not the religious but the political—and the wrong political—side. Clement VIII trusted to schemers who plotted treason, to conspirators who hatched murder, to visionaries who dreamed dreams. The unfortunate English Catholics paid the penalty. The Pope did not, he said, desire toleration for them; toleration would destroy their faith. At home the Jesuits controlled the funds, and the ecclesiastical machine was at their disposal. The Appellants had not the courage to resist them; and though no more than a fraction of the laity was with the extreme party, the stronger wills carried the day. The Concordat controversy in France under Pius X is a modern parallel. In England it was not, however, till the Gunpowder Plot had shocked the conscience and shaken the nerve of the country, that the prospect of accommodation finally disappeared. *Delicta majorum immeritus lues*. The world-war may be as disastrous for French Catholicism as the Plot was for English; the wise and moderate Benedict XV may pay the penalty for his predecessor's sin.

Bancroft was a link between the Elizabethan and the Stuart periods, dying Nov. 10, 1610. Whitgift's last words had been "*Pro Ecclesia Dei*!" None such are reported of his successor, nor would they have been in keeping with his temper. He was neither a saint nor saintly. But, so far as human judgment can measure it, the best service to the Church and to religion has not been done by saints, nor even by distinctly religious-minded men. Saints have, as a rule, left behind them a legacy of questions, to which those who were not saints have been hard pressed to find a solution, and have seldom succeeded in finding one on purely religious ground or by purely religious means. And at critical times the quiet virtues which we associate, perhaps too exclusively, with religion,

fall into the background. There is not time to cultivate them. The rough work of the world, the cutting and carving of its raw material into shape, is done by rough instruments; not by pietists but by elemental men. No idealizing will transform Bancroft into any clerical type with which we are familiar; we cannot place him in the world of modern religious party—with its shibboleths, its abstractions, its symbols. A man of action, he concerned himself neither with names nor notions, but with concrete interests and tangible things. His work was taken over by men of narrower outlook and less moderate temper—and spoiled in the taking. He had learned to be “supple in things immaterial”; had he stood in Laud’s place at Charles’ elbow, the royal blood would not have stained the scaffold of Whitehall. He left a tradition at Lambeth which is not extinct, and whose extinction would be a misfortune. It is the voice not of Laud but of Bancroft that speaks to this day from St. Augustine’s chair. Hence the ill-disguised irritation of enthusiasts, the dissatisfaction of men of curious and speculative temper, and the general assent of that average, if neither very spiritual, very enlightened, nor very interesting, opinion which is the strength of Churches, and on which, in the last resort, society, religious and secular, as we know it, rests.

ALFRED FAWKES.

ASHBY ST. LEDGERS, RUGBY, ENGLAND.

LA CONTROVERSE DE MARTIN MARPRELATE, 1588-1590: EPISODE DE L'HISTOIRE LITTÉRAIRE DU PURITANISME SOUS ELIZABETH. G. BONNARD, Docteur ès Lettres. Genève. A. Julien. 1916. Pp. xv, 237. 4 fr.

The religious life of England under Elizabeth has received much recent illumination. The careful studies of Roman Catholic conditions, some of which have been reviewed in these pages, have enlarged, through the work of Catholic and Protestant scholars alike, our knowledge of the fate of the Roman obedience and of its adherents. An American student, Roland G. Usher, has discussed the Presbyterian Movement under Elizabeth, the Reconstruction, chiefly by Richard Bancroft, of the English Church, and the work of the High Commission. Another American scholar, Champlin Burrage, has thrown much light on the early English Dissenters. W. H. Frere has made accessible a number of rare Puritan manifestos. We are getting to know the facts, the persons, and the influences of religious England in the significant Elizabethan age more minutely and more accurately.

No episode of this epoch is more picturesque, and none has been subjected to more careful recent study, than that of the Martin Marprelate controversy. In a sense, its latest investigator, M. Bonnard, has little that is new to offer. He has not been able to add materially to the sources already at disposal, or to do more than confirm the attribution of the authorship of these lively Puritan tracts to Job Throckmorton—a conclusion generally accepted at present, in spite of the recent dissent of that excellent English scholar, Mr. J. D. Wilson.

If M. Bonnard has been able to make no startling discoveries, however, his work has been none the less worth doing. He has gone over the whole field in most painstaking fashion. No study of the Marprelate dispute gives the reader so careful an analysis of its publications or of those of Martin's opponents, or so successfully puts them into relation to their time. None gives so clear an impression of the significance of the whole dispute and of its importance, both for the later development of Puritanism and in arousing in the defenders of the Church of England an assertion of the *jure divino* nature of Episcopacy over against the *jure divino* claims of Puritan Presbyterianism. M. Bonnard's careful treatise is therefore a welcome contribution to the growing literature of an important period. It may be hoped that leisure may be his to write that larger history of the origins and growth of Puritanism which has been his ideal, but which he fears may never be realized. If one may judge by the excellence of the present monograph, that more ambitious undertaking would be very much worth the doing.

WILLISTON WALKER.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

LES PROTESTANTS ANGLAIS, RÉFUGIÉS À GENÈVE AU TEMPS DE CALVIN, 1555-1560. CHARLES MARTIN, Docteur en théologie, Ancien pasteur à Genève. Genève. A. Julien, Éditeur. 1915. Pp. xiv, 354. 7 fr. 50c.

A single paragraph in Macaulay, a few sentences in Green, and scanty references in Froude, comprise the attention our leading historians have given to one of the most important episodes, from a political and religious point of view, in the Reformation period.

On the death of Edward VI and the accession of his half-sister, Mary, about eight hundred English Protestants fled from England to escape the persecution which was imminent under a Roman Catholic queen. Every one knows of the little band of Protestant leaders who remained in England to perish at the stake—Latimer

and Ridley and Cranmer and the rest. But some brave men, like John Knox himself, did not think it their duty to remain. They reasoned like Athanasius in similar circumstances. It is plain that Cranmer himself would have fled and that the authorities were willing to make it easy for him to do so, but that he felt that his great post compelled him to stay and take what might come. The captain must be the last to leave the ship.

These refugees scattered on the Continent—principally to Embden, Frankfort, Zürich, Basel, and Geneva. In this interesting monograph Dr. Martin has given us a careful account of those who found a home at Geneva. He has investigated their careers before they came to Geneva, their occupations there, especially their literary labors, and has devoted much attention to their work in translating the Bible into English—the Geneva Bible, a version so dear to Puritan New England. And the whole is supplemented by a satisfactory bibliography. We could wish that Dr. Martin had enlarged the scope of his work to render a similar service to the refugees at Frankfort. The controversies at Frankfort were highly interesting. Here the question of an authoritative liturgy split the little congregation into warring parties, and at Frankfort the issue of the democratic constitution of the church was raised and settled as it could not be at Geneva under the dominating influence of Calvin.

It would have been well if Dr. Martin had contemplated more definitely the writing of *l'histoire* rather than giving us *memoirs pour servir*. The main significance of the Marian Exiles is vastly more important than the details of their tasks, or even their work itself at Geneva or anywhere else. When they returned to England, after having sat for five years at the feet of Calvin and of the great Protestant doctors of Basel, Zürich, and Frankfort, they were thoroughly imbued with Protestant ideas. When they reached England, all the great places at the universities and all the bishoprics, with one exception, were vacant. Education in England was at its lowest ebb, and Elizabeth was determined to have an educated leadership in the English Church. There was no single group of men in England so thoroughly well-educated as the Protestant Exiles who came trooping back from the Continent. From this group Elizabeth at once chose the heads of the colleges and filled up the bench of bishops. That is why English theology at once became so strongly Calvinistic, and remained so up to the days of Archbishop Laud; and that is why there was implanted in the Church of England those tendencies which were soon to manifest themselves in

the Presbyterianism of Cartwright and the Independency of Robert Browne.

GEORGE E. HERR.

THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION,
NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.

CONVERSATIONS WITH LUTHER, translated and edited by PRESERVED SMITH, Ph.D., and H. P. GALLINGER, Ph.D. The Pilgrim Press. 1915. Pp. xxviii, 260. \$1.00.

This little book of selections from Luther's *Table-Talk* has the merits and the defects of most books of selections. Such books represent the editor's idea of what is most significant in the work of the author, and this idea is never quite the same as that of any reader. Nor can selections ever be quite just to the author's intention. If these reflections are true of such attempts in general, they are doubly true in the case of a man like Luther, whose tongue and pen were uncontrollably active, seeming at times to have wills of their own, independent of their master's volition. Furthermore, any modern editor can in this case do no more than make a selection from several previous selections.

It is safe to say that no man ever lived whose scattered utterances could be more variously interpreted than those of Luther can be and have been. He can be praised or blamed as heartily as any one pleases, and both praise and blame can be justified out of his own mouth. And while this may be said of all his writing and speaking it is especially true of the so-called *Table-Talk*, at once the most popular and the least trustworthy of his published utterances. The method—or lack of method—by which this compilation was thrown together is briefly described in the editors' Introduction and in one short chapter. Nothing could well be more casual. First one and then another, sometimes several at a time, of Luther's younger table companions jotted down as they were spoken as many of his words as they could catch, and these random notes were then recast into something like literary form. They are of interest as showing the immense variety of subjects on which a great man's mind was working and his mental attitude at different moments toward the problems which his restless activity forced upon him. On the other hand, they are as dangerous a source as can well be imagined for any serious judgment of the Reformer's character or his permanent and constructive opinions.

It is one of the merits of the present volume that it reproduces fairly well this casual effect. Its chapters are topically arranged,

so that one gains at a glance a certain view of Luther's passing thoughts about any given subject. The choice of topics is judicious, and the comparative space allotted to them is in reasonable proportion. As to the qualification of the editors there can be no question, especially Dr. Smith's previous work in the Luther material being a sufficient guarantee of his care and accuracy.

FRANCIS ASBURY, THE PROPHET OF THE LONG ROAD. EZRA SQUIER TIPPLE, D.D., President of Drew Theological Seminary. The Methodist Book Concern. 1916. Pp. 333. \$1.50.

It is a noteworthy fact that while Washington, Franklin, the Adamases, and Thomas Jefferson, with their patriot contemporaries, were laying the foundations of our Republic, and great political ideals were shaping the destiny of a new nation in this new world, there were men of lofty spiritual vision, whose eyes were fixed upon the Kingdom of God, who believed that the new nation must be a part of that Kingdom if it was to be strong and enduring. They wanted the victories of righteousness even more than they desired triumph for the Revolutionary armies.

Francis Asbury was a conspicuous representative of that class of men who did great service to the cause of American nation-building, a service entirely aside from the political and military fields. President Tipple has made this man stand forth in clear and impressive traits in the fascinating chapters of his biography. Asbury was born of humble English parentage and had no such advantages of education as did John and Charles Wesley; but he caught from them and from George Whitefield the fire of evangelizing purpose which moved him to his great work in the new American States. He arrived in Philadelphia (1771), having responded to John Wesley's call for men to go to America, while the Colonies were still under British power, and the muttering of revolutionary sentiments was beginning to be heard. But Asbury took no part in political debate. A man of one book, the Bible, zealous for one great cause — the spread of Gospel truth and light — he devoted himself without diversion and with unresting energy to his one work. In 1766 New York City had a population of only 12,000. A few warm-hearted persons — like Barbara Heck, Philip Embury, Captain Thomas Webb — had established the nucleus of a Methodist congregation and built a meeting-house in 1768. Asbury's first sermon in New York was preached in this building in 1771. Two purposes dominated him in his preaching and in his

administration of religious affairs. His supreme motive was to be a herald of the Gospel far and wide in this great domain of the new world. He had begun preaching in England at the age of seventeen. He had a passion for the work of evangelism. He never faltered; but hardships and obstacles of every kind, as he pioneered his way through the Long Road of a wilderness country, only increased his zeal and intensified his earnestness in proclaiming the Glad Tidings at every possible opportunity. He preached in rude cabins, in rough meeting-houses, in "rigging lofts," in great open-air gatherings; wherever there was a chance he was ready. His *Journal*, as finally published in three volumes, is one of the best sources in which to study the early social and religious conditions in America in the eighteenth century. It is also rich in the portrayal of the beginnings of the Methodist Episcopal denomination. He was a man after Wesley's own heart in his diligent habits—in private devotions, in reading good books on theology, history, poetry, and biography, in his "care of all the churches" that sprang into life along his missionary journeying, and in a large correspondence, which at one time he mentioned as amounting to a thousand letters in a year; no stenographer or typewriter to lighten the burden!

The second great purpose in Asbury's life was to lay broadly and firmly the foundations of Methodism in America. He was made a Bishop in 1784. From that time till his death (1816) he was the chief itinerant of the denomination—travelling an average of six thousand miles a year on horseback. But before his episcopal labors began he spent thirteen years on the great circuits—one of which measured two hundred miles—and had twenty-four preaching appointments that he met every three weeks. Asbury was a somewhat strict disciplinarian. Even as John Wesley was a commanding power in the ecclesiastical affairs of the Wesleyan Revival in England, so was Asbury the ruling spirit for his time and for early Methodism in America.

At the very Conference by which Asbury was made a bishop in 1784, the Methodist Episcopal Church in America was organized and named, and the Bishop began immediately his absorbing superintendency. His first tour, starting from Baltimore, took him as far South as Charleston, and back again to Mt. Vernon, where he called upon George Washington.

The strong mind of Asbury was thus felt in the first stages of the organic life of Methodism in this nation. Wesley had not contemplated an independent denomination when he sent Coke and Asbury hither as missionaries. But Asbury and the men who worked with

him felt the necessity of a church-order just as independent of the mother-church in England as the American Colonies became independent of Great Britain by the Declaration of Independence and the subsequent adoption of the Constitution. President Tipple points out the fact that there were two Revolutions effected in that stirring period: one political, by force of arms; the other ecclesiastical, by force of circumstances, which Asbury and his fellow-laborers were wise enough to make the ground of their action. "If any, with haughty air and the vain conceit of a crushing logic, still demand where the Methodists got their episcopacy, the true and sufficient answer is, by the good will of God they got it from themselves. This they did; and no church has a better or more valid episcopacy" (John Miley, at the Centennial Methodist Conference in Baltimore in 1884).

Asbury was a tireless itinerant. In his annual or semi-annual episcopal journeys, he visited every new State of the Union. He went into New York more than fifty times; New Jersey, over sixty; Pennsylvania, seventy-eight; Maryland, eighty; North Carolina, sixty-three; South Carolina, forty-six; Virginia, eighty-four; Tennessee and Georgia, each twenty; Massachusetts, twenty-three times after his visit there in 1791. His *Journal* has few complaints; and yet, from the sheer suffering of a sensitive soul, he does sometimes break through his heroic reserve. At one time he wrote, "To be three months upon the frontiers, where, generally, you have but one room and fire-place, and half a dozen folks about you, where you *may* meditate if you can, and where you *must* preach, read, write, pray, sing, talk, eat, drink, and sleep — or fly into the woods! . . . Six months in the year I have had for thirty-two years to submit, occasionally, to what will never be agreeable to me. The people are among the kindest souls in the world. But kindness will not make a crowded cabin, twelve feet by ten, agreeable."

Dangers lurked in many of his roads. "Wolves follow him; his horse falls; he is lost in the swamps of South Carolina; through another's carelessness he is nearly burnt; his startled horse throws him into a mill-race; a whirl-wind with hail nearly overcomes him; ruffians seek his life, a bullet grazing his head as he rides through the forest." The list of his adventures and hardships reads like a chapter from the experience of an apostle of the early church.

Forty-five years Asbury was the foremost preacher in American Methodism. About seventeen thousand sermons, it is estimated, were delivered by this modern apostle, and comparatively few of them in comfortable, churchly conditions. He preached because

he had a passion for proclaiming the Gospel; and his evangelistic appeals were constantly made to men, even in casual social intercourse. He not only "prayed without ceasing," often spending three or four hours a day in prayer, but he preached Good Tidings incessantly, by making use of every opportunity to urge men to become the disciples of Christ. His greatness in the pulpit was his burning intensity. He had not the graces and the skill of an orator, but his earnestness made him eloquent. He was a stern critic of his own preaching, and made such comments upon some of his sermons as these: "I roared out wonderfully"; "I had no power to speak to the people"; "bore a feeble testimony for nearly an hour"; "I preached and stormed a great deal." But the testimony of many thousands of his hearers was that this man reached the consciences of multitudes, spoke with spiritual authority, and never faltered in his purpose to spread Scriptural religion over this new land.

President Tipple's masterly analysis that portrays Asbury's powers as a preacher, an administrator, and a man of remarkable traits of character, has made to the literature of American history a choice contribution. Bishop Asbury's devotion and tireless labors gave him a distinctive right to be named a modern "Prophet." The "Road" he travelled was made illustrious by the wayside testimony he bore, at every turn, and in every stopping-place, that the "faith once delivered" is the "power of God unto salvation."

WILLIAM EDWARDS HUNTINGTON.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

THE HOLY QUR'ĀN, WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION AND EXPLANATORY NOTES.

Part I. Pp. viii, 117. [Through Sura 2, verse 142.] Published by the Anjuman-i-Taraqqi-i-Islam, Qādiān. Punjab, India. 1915.

About forty years ago there appeared in the town of Qādiān, near Lahore in the Punjab, a religious leader, Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, who before his death, which occurred in 1908, was hailed by his numerous followers as the Messiah promised by all the great prophets of antiquity. The Aḥmadiya sect called by his name has continued to spread, chiefly in the Far East but also to some extent in the West, even gaining adherents in England. It is Mohammedan in its origin, and claims to represent the true Islam, the one universal religion; by orthodox Moslems, however, the Aḥmadiya movement is looked upon as heretical. The sacred book of the new sect is the Qur'ān, and the commentary before us is being prepared as

its authoritative interpretation. It is an ambitious undertaking, and one in which scholars the world over would be keenly interested if it were in competent hands. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

The appearance of the quarto page is very attractive. At the top is the Arabic text, reproducing in large characters a masterpiece of calligraphy. Below this is a transliteration in Roman letters, followed by the English translation in large type. The principal part of the page is usually taken up with the commentary. Below, in finer print, are running notes of a more general — often controversial — character; and at the bottom of the page are references to parallel passages.

In regard to previous English translations of the Qur'ān the author says (Foreword, p. 5) that they "have been done either by those who were swayed by nothing but religious prejudice and whose object was . . . the presentation of a ghastly picture of the Holy Qur'ān before the world; or by those who had no acquaintance worth the name with the Holy Qur'ān and the Arabic language." He claims to have followed a new and original method, by which the chance of error has been practically removed. "We have not based the translation and notes, and in fact every other matter connected therewith, on current stories and popular tales; but, on the other hand, our procedure has been to base the meaning of every word first on the corroborative testimony of the Holy Qur'ān, and secondly on the context. The same golden rule has been observed in the preparation of notes." Examination of the rendering shows that it is in the main correct and good, but decidedly inferior in point of trustworthiness to those of Sale, Rodwell, and Palmer, to which it is of course very greatly indebted.

The nature and extent of the author's equipment for a work of scholarly research will be apparent from the following examples. Under transliteration (Foreword, pp. 6 f.): "*Alif* at the beginning of a word, pronounced as *a*, *i*, *u*, preceded by a very slight aspiration, like *h* in the English word 'honour'; *dhāl*, pronounced like the English *th* in 'that'; *dād*, similar to the English *th* in 'this'; *hamza*, a sort of catch in the voice." In matters of etymology: The word *shaiṭān* (p. 16) "comes either from the root *shṭn* or *shyt*." In fact, he decides, it comes from *both* roots (why should it not?). "The former means 'straying away from truth,' and therefore *Shaiṭān* means 'one who has gone astray from the right path.' Taking the latter root, which means 'burning,' the word *Shaiṭān* signifies 'one burnt or doomed to perish.' Thus, *Shayāṭīn* signifies 'those men . . . who were burning with jealousy and hate to see the Muslims prosper,

and who had gone astray from the truth.” This same liberality in the recognition of Arabic roots and the combination of various meanings appears in many places. Thus, as to the meaning of the word *sūra* (p. 22): “Literally, a piece, a portion. Here it means a chapter, a section that has been set apart. *Sūrat* also means ‘height.’ In keeping with this sense, the chapters of the Qur’ān are called *Sūrahs* because they contain each a discourse on a lofty subject.” In commenting on 2:36 [33 in Flügel], the account of Adam’s temptation and fall in the Garden of Eden, our interpreter explains the meaning of the two principal words in the clause: “Approach not this *shajara*, lest ye be among the *ẓālimīn*.” *Shajara* means “tree,” but in the Qur’ān it “is also used to mean a quarrel, as in the verse . . . 4:66 [68 in Flügel]. The Qur’ān also mentions elsewhere both a ‘pure tree’ and an ‘evil tree.’ In the light of these Quranic explanations, the verse means, (1) that Adam was forbidden to quarrel; (2) that Adam was warned against evil things.” “As for the other word, *ẓālim*, the root means, first, ‘putting a thing in a wrong place or in a place not its own.’ Secondly, . . . etc. The phrase would thus mean that the result of approaching the *Shajarah* would be that he (Adam) would become one of those who do not observe the propriety of time and place in their actions.” What this kind of learning can accomplish in the way of etymologies is also well illustrated in the case of Gabriel (p. 80); the angels Hārūt and Mārūt, the former from *harata* “to tear” and the latter from *marata* “to break” (p. 85); the borrowed words — here of course regarded as genuine Arabic — *ḥanīf* and *sabt* (p. 113 f.). The following lexical and grammatical notes are characteristic: “It is a rule in Arabic grammar that whenever somebody is required to be induced to do a thing, the verb is omitted and only the object is mentioned” (p. 116). “The Hebrew word Elohim, which originally meant ‘to be strong’ has come to mean ‘the strong one’” (p. 80). On page 115 there is a (somewhat misleading) reference to the Robinson-Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon of the year 1836.

The intolerance and discourtesy of the author, illustrated above in his treatment of the previous translators, are unfortunately characteristic of the whole work. This makes it the more difficult to be patient with the very meagre, thinly spread observations which occupy the place of a commentary. The great bulk of the material in this department is either homiletical or controversial. Leaving this out of account, there is very little remaining that could help any one understand the Qur’ān, and nothing with which a trained scholar — of any land or religious belief — could be satisfied.

One or two illustrations must suffice. Sūra 2:73 f. [67 f.], the story of the Red Heifer, where the text reads: "Ye (Israelites) killed a man (*qatalum nafsān*); . . . then We said, 'Strike him (the dead man) with a part of her (the heifer)'; thus Allāh gives life to the dead," etc. Our translator renders: "Ye almost killed a person. . . . Then We said, 'Smite it (margin: i.e., the class responsible for the sufferings of the man whose murder was attempted) for a part of its (sin).'" Then follows the explanation: The word *nafsān* is undetermined, "which often denotes a sense of grandeur. So the wording of the verse itself points to the inference that the person killed is a remarkably grand personality. . . . Such a one can be no other than a prophet. . . . Our investigation has so far enabled us to affirm with absolute certainty that he was a prophet. The verse also enlightens us on another important fact. It shows that the Israelites entertained doubts as to his death. . . . So the person spoken of in this verse can be no other than Jesus Christ." This, he affirms (p. 61), explains the last clause of verse 73 [67]: "And Allāh would bring to light what ye concealed." "With the appearance of the Promised Messiah [Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad], the mask which had been so long hanging over the incident has at last been thrown off." With this may be compared certain comments on the First Sūra, pages 2 and 3. Its title, *Fātiḥa*, "occurs in a prophecy in the [New Testament] Revelation, chapter 10, which also contains a reference to the number of verses in this Sūrah. The name occurs in the second verse . . . where it is translated as *open*. The original Hebrew word is *Fatoah* [sic]. . . . The seven thunders in the prophecy represent the seven verses of this chapter. The Christian writers agree in holding that the prophecy refers to the second advent of Jesus and they are right in their opinion. [It should be remarked here, that the Messiah of the Punjab claims to embody the returning Jesus, as well as the Mahdi of the Moslems.] The little book *Fatoah* or *Fātiḥah* was constantly in the hands of the Promised Messiah, who wrote many commentaries on this chapter." He adds, that the inspired Interpreter revealed in the chapter many great truths which no one had found there before, since it had hitherto remained a "sealed book" (Rev. 10 4). It is one of these unsuspected truths, doubtless, which our commentator presents in his interpretation of the closing verse, the text of which he renders as follows: "[Guide us in] the path of those on whom Thou hast bestowed Thy blessings; excepting those on whom Thy wrath has descended and those who have gone astray." On this he remarks: "The last verse of this chapter embodies a mighty prophecy. . . . [It] contains a promise

for the advent of a Messiah, for whose rejection the Muslims are threatened to be reckoned among the Jews and whose advent was to be preceded by the ascendancy of the Christian religion. The Messiah referred to in this verse has already appeared, and his name is Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān (Punjab, India)."

It is quite plain from these last examples especially, that the main purpose of this translation and commentary is not to inquire into the meaning of the Qur'ān, but to present a religious leader. How much of the exegesis offered here is derived from the latter, is an interesting question. Near the beginning of the commentary (p. 5) our author names 'Abdallah Ibn 'Abbās and the Promised Messiah as his two chief authorities. Those who hold the view of Ibn 'Abbās' trustworthiness which is held by all competent occidental scholars will feel that this lays a great weight of responsibility on the Messiah. And in fact, belief in the infallibility of this divine emissary — and his lesser representatives — will be found indispensable to acceptance of the views contained in this volume. The claims of the Promised One and the proofs in support of them are set forth in some detail on the cover of this First Part of the work, as well as in accompanying circulars. The last Imām in the great succession of twelve disappeared from human sight in the Mohammedan year 266 (879 A.D.), since which time his reappearance has been eagerly awaited by a large part of the Moslem world. After the lapse of just 1000 (solar) years, in 1879 A.D., the leader stands forth at Qādiān. Again, the Prophet Daniel prophesied [12 11] that "1290 years after the breaking of idols in Mecca" the Messenger would appear. The breaking of idols took place in the Mohammedan year 8; the addition of 1290 (lunar) years gives the equivalent of the Christian year 1881. Moreover, "just as the Israelite Messiah appeared 1300 years after Moses, similarly the Promised Messiah made his appearance 1300 years after the Holy Prophet." In fact, Moses appeared 1300 (solar) years B.C., and 1300 (lunar) years after the Hijra brings us to 1882 A.D. This is all interesting as illustrating the credentials which can be obtained from chronology. "The Holy Prophet of Islam . . . even named the very place where the promised Mahdi was to appear. He called it Kad'a, a name which is quite like the name *Kadi* or *Kadian*." This is certainly striking; and it is remarkable that the fact of this prediction should have remained so long unknown to the learned world, and especially to Mohammedan scholars. The Punjab Messiah has also himself foretold many events, it would seem. "He published hundreds of prophecies, many of which have already come true (such as his

prophecy regarding the Partition of Bengal, the defeat of Russia and the annexation of Korea by Japan, the Persian Revolution, the outbreak of plague in India, . . . the downfall and death of Dr. Dowie, the false prophet of America, etc., etc.), and many still await fulfilment."

With all the blind prejudice of the book, the extravagance of its exegesis, and the preponderance of unpleasant controversy, it contains much genuine and deep religious feeling. The movement of which it is the outgrowth can certainly command our sympathy, and we can only wish it success in its greater aims. The conviction, expressed again and again in these pages, that the world is in sore need of a spiritual awakening will find its echo everywhere, perhaps not less in the West than in the East. But the interpreter of such a marvellous monument as the Qur'ān has need of an exceptional equipment if his work is to be widely useful. He must be thoroughly acquainted with the Arabic tongue in its historical development; with the ideas and customs prevailing in Mecca and Medina in the seventh century; with the languages and faiths from which Mohammed appropriated so much; with the peculiar personality of the great Prophet himself; with the literary and especially rhetorical considerations which explain so much that is otherwise inexplicable. He must take fair account of the voluminous literature in the field, including not only the learned native commentators but also the widely scattered modern investigations. He will need both critical acumen, in examining the work of the interpreters and the sacred book itself, and also a breadth of view that can take some adequate account of the evolution of the great faiths of the world. The author of the present work is plainly unable to meet any one of these requirements. His commentary may serve a useful purpose as a text-book for the adherents of the Ahmadiya faith, but as an interpretation it can hardly have value for others.

CHARLES C. TORREY.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE MYSTICS OF ISLAM. REYNOLD A. NICHOLSON, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.
G. Bell & Sons. 1914.

No living scholar is more competent to treat this subject than Nicholson. He is one of a small circle of English scholars who have in recent times added so much to the materials for a knowledge of Sufism by the publication and interpretation of Arabic and Persian texts, and we hope some day to have from his hand a comprehensive history of Moslem mysticism, to the study of which he has given

a large part of his life. In the present volume he has naturally made no attempt to treat the subject historically, but only to make plain to the reader, so far as such things can be made plain, the nature and methods of this mysticism. After an introduction on the origin and development of Sufism in its relation to Islam, and the external influences which affected it (Christianity, Neoplatonism, Gnosticism, and Buddhism), the author devotes a chapter each to The Path, Illumination and Ecstasy, The Gnosis, Divine Love, Saints and Miracles, The Unitive State. A selected bibliography of writings on Sufism and of English translations of Sufi authors, with an index, completes the volume, the interest and worth of which are much enhanced by the abundant translations, chiefly by the author himself, in which the mystics are allowed to tell in their own way of the Path, and the Goal, and the Experience that makes the speaker dumb.

GEORGE FOOT MOORE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

PHASES OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY 100 A.D.-250 A.D. J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, D.Litt. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1916. Pp. xvi, 449. \$2.00.

The ex-Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, is well qualified to figure among the lecturers in the American inter-collegiate course on the History of Religions. He is an authority in the history and literature of Buddhism as well as in the early history of Christianity, and the lectures as now published show such mastery of the field of study that the reader is conscious that the high standard of former years suffers no diminution.

Principal Carpenter is the first in the series of lecturers to deal with the history of Christianity. His survey covers the period from 100-250 A.D., and his method is to reproduce in condensed outline the principal literary monuments of Christian thought.

Recent inquiry into the interaction of the oriental religions, which in the period of the early empire overflowed Western paganism and rivalled nascent Christianity in proclaiming ways of personal redemption and salvation of the soul by participation in the divine nature, has paved the way for Principal Carpenter's discussions of "Christianity as Personal Salvation" and "The Person and Work of the Saviour," and furnished much of his material. The lectures which follow these two opening discussions are on "The Church as the Sphere of Salvation," "The Sacraments as the Means of Salvation," "Salvation by Gnosis," and "Christianity at the Parting of the Ways"; by which is meant the beginnings of Roman hierocracy.

Seldom can the student of the development of Christian doctrine and Christian institutions find a more competent and more unbiased guide. It was time a restatement should come having regard to the better knowledge so recently acquired of conditions and modes of religious thought in the pagan world. Both scholars and the reading public will be grateful that Principal Carpenter has given his attention to this subject, as well as for the thoroughness with which he has performed the task.

BENJAMIN W. BACON.

YALE SCHOOL OF RELIGION.

THE MYTHOLOGY OF ALL RACES. Vol. IX, Oceanic. ROLAND B. DIXON, Ph.D., Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University. Marshall Jones Co. 1917. Pp. xv, 364; 1 map, 24 plates, 3 figures.

The lack of convenient summaries of up-to-date information has been painfully manifest in the field of anthropology for a number of years. On practically every topic the older synthetic work, while often significant and still valuable, requires amplification and revision, while the more recent attempts are almost uniformly deficient in both trustworthiness of data and progressiveness of viewpoint. In condensing the vast and scattered material on Oceanian mythology into a single volume Professor Dixon has thus rendered a great service both to his colleagues and that ever widening circle of lay readers who take an interest in the ways and thoughts of primitive man.

The subject-matter is treated under the obvious geographical headings. In the apportionment of space the very unequal character of the available sources was the main determinant, the meagre discussion of Micronesia being the inevitable result of inadequate raw data. It seems especially lamentable that we are wholly without knowledge of the mythology of the most primitive peoples of the region, viz., the Tasmanians and Negrito populations. In all the sections the ethnologist would have preferred fuller treatment of what the author calls "miscellaneous tales"; but here he was obviously obliged to conform to the general editorial scheme of the series.

In his account of Polynesian mythology Professor Dixon establishes a point of primary importance. It had been commonly assumed that Polynesian cosmogony was fashioned on a single pattern of the so-called genealogical or evolutionary type, "the successive stages in the development of the cosmos being individualized and personified and each being regarded as the offspring of the next

preceding." Thus, in one Maori version we find the primeval Void giving rise to the First Void, which is successively superseded by the Second Void, the Vast Void, and so forth through a considerable number of generations (p. 6). But however interesting these accounts may be as revealing the power of abstraction and metaphysical speculation of which the natives are capable, there are other Polynesian tales in which the universe does not evolve but is created by pre-existing deities. The evidence for this conclusion is convincingly set forth by the author. The only doubt that occurs to the reviewer is whether the elaborate genealogies may not be due to individual (or for that matter esoteric group) speculation rather than be characteristic of the belief of the people at large. This possibility would not in any way detract from the historical significance of the distribution data as outlined by Professor Dixon. On the other hand, it does not seem necessary to assume (p. 9) that where, as in New Zealand, both types of cosmogony coexist, each has a distinct geographical centre of dispersal and that the association is due to a contact of two distinct tribes. Such may be the case, but some weight should be given to the alternative hypothesis. In North America, where several versions of the same myth have often been recorded in the same locality, a considerable influence of the narrator's personality, whether as regards philosophical power or æsthetic taste, is undeniable, and a parallel condition of affairs may plausibly be inferred to hold for Oceania.

By comparison with Polynesia the cosmogonic instinct is but poorly developed among the natives of Melanesia, but a difference is noticeable between the Papuan and the properly Melanesian layer of mythology, the latter exhibiting much greater elaboration of this feature. Other peculiarities distinguish the tales of these two racial divisions. In Papuan lore ghosts loom prominently, while the tales of the Melanesians abound in cannibalistic episodes, and display a tendency toward dualism in the opposition of a wise and benevolent hero to his foolish and malicious brother.

The investigation of Indonesian mythology required a sifting of Islamic and Buddhistic influences, both of which the author has fully taken into account. His extensive use of Dutch sources, mostly unavailable for the majority of his readers, deserves special recognition.

In Australia Professor Dixon finds evidence of two distinct types of mythologies—the southeastern, which shows a greater development of the cosmogonic theme, and the northern and central type, in which totemic tales predominate. Some of the facts of distri-

bution are very perplexing indeed, such as the appearance of Melanesian motives in the southeastern regions. As the author realizes, a satisfactory interpretation of the data is rendered difficult by the absence of Tasmanian and West Australian data.

Throughout the volume Professor Dixon pays attention to the problem of historical connection, offering tentative but for the most part sane and stimulating suggestions as to the contact of the several Oceanian populations. It seems a great pity, and is probably the only serious deficiency of his work, that he has not been equally generous in his treatment of American parallels. To be sure, a fair number of these are mentioned, but their theoretical treatment is casual and in the conclusion entirely too summary. These resemblances are so remarkable that Tylor in his *Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, in spite of his bias in favor of independent development of cultural features, was constrained to suggest an historical connection between the New and the Old World. This general problem has become a perennial one in ethnological circles, and a table setting forth all the significant similarities between Oceanian and American lore would have been of the greatest service.

In conclusion, a tribute should be paid to the literary deftness with which Professor Dixon has handled his subject. Even to the professional ethnologist a volume of primitive tales generally forebodes a considerable measure of boredom, but the author's method of treatment has very successfully overcome this difficulty, so that the book makes decidedly interesting reading.

ROBERT H. LOWIE.

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY,
NEW YORK.

THE INDIVIDUAL DELINQUENT. WILLIAM HEALY. Little, Brown, & Co.
1915. Pp. xviii, 830.

Criminological literature since the days of Lombroso has been characterized by the lavish production of one-sided theories concerning the origin of crime. A few notable text-book writers (e.g., Aschaffenburg, Ferri, Bonger, De Quiros) have synthesized the findings of the monographists and have suggested that each criminal act is to be traced to a variety of factors, both constitutional and environmental. Few studies of all of the important causative factors of crime have been written covering large numbers of individual criminals. Recently, however, two very significant contributions have been made to this literature, both of which are more valuable in many respects than any preceding studies in this field.

These two are Goring's *The English Convict* and Healy's *The Individual Delinquent*. The former, prepared by an associate of Karl Pearson, is a biometrical study of 3000 adult males "guilty of grave and repeated offences" and imprisoned in the Parkhurst Prison in England. The latter is a study made in Chicago of 1000 juvenile delinquents, mostly repeaters.

The cases covered in *The Individual Delinquent* were selected from those brought before the Psychopathic Institute of the Juvenile Court of Chicago. The study was confined to the "formative period, for the sake of learning the structural growth of whole delinquent careers." "Just because the delinquent's character is the result of a long-continued process of growth, one needs to regard him as the product of forces, as well as the sum of his present constituent parts; one must study him dynamically as well as statically, genetically as well as a finished result."

The aim of Dr. Healy's work is stated to be "to ascertain from the actualities of life the basic factors of disordered social conduct," and its field is termed "characterology," for "as students of character we are dealing with the motives and driving forces of human conduct, and, since conduct is directly a product of mental life, we immediately become involved in individual and differential psychology." Dr. Healy's book, though it may not be criticised fairly as unilateral, stresses the psychological factors of crime.

The first chapters are on Orientations and the Mental Bases of Delinquency. These are followed by three chapters on Working Methods, submitting a schedule used for recording case-histories, and showing the order and the form of examination of each case, and by a long chapter on the mental tests, which includes a description of some new tests devised by Dr. Healy. These are followed by a chapter on Statistics, which classifies and enumerates certain of the causes of crime, by a chapter on methodological conclusions, and by another on conclusions as to treatment of cases.

The chapter on Statistics of the cases is a summary of Dr. Healy's findings. The Statistical analysis of home-conditions, of mental conflicts, of sex-experiences, of physical conditions, of "unsatisfied interests," of early developmental conditions, has the appearance of precision. It is unfortunately not well explained nor is the basis of the differentiation of cases well shown. Nevertheless, the chapter, as it stands, is an important contribution to criminological literature.

The cautiousness of the writer is displayed at several points in the statistical chapter. Avoiding the present tendency to blame criminality upon heredity, he lists defects of heredity as a minor causative

factor of criminality in 502 out of 823 cases, and never as a main factor. (We wonder if heredity played no appreciable part in the production of the remaining cases of criminality.) "Feeble-mindedness" is listed as a major factor in 92 cases, and "mental subnormality" in 66 cases, but 455 are listed as showing "mental abnormality" or "peculiar mental characteristics." This is a cautious attempt to sub-divide narrowly the mental peculiarities of cases. Other specialists would probably have classified a larger fraction of cases under "feeble-mindedness." One may wonder also what may be the significance of listing 455 out of 823 cases as possessing "mental peculiarities." How large a percentage of the general population would he have discovered by the same tests to suffer from "mental peculiarities"?

Dr. Healy's findings concerning the stigmata of degeneracy are of interest, because like Goring he discovers no support for the theory of the origin of crime in atavism, as broached by Lombroso. Well-marked stigmata were found in 133 of the 1000 cases. Those structural anomalies "which could be found by careful examination on almost every human body have altogether been left out of count." The presence of the stigmata is considered in its relation to mental peculiarities, and Healy concludes, "If the cases of mental abnormality were taken out of our series, the proportion of marked stigmata would be little, if any, larger than in the general population."

Book II treats of "Cases, Types, Causative Factors," and deals in considerable detail with cases illustrating factors of heredity, physical ailments and abnormalities, the use of stimulants. Environmental factors are treated briefly, but psychological factors are discussed through twenty chapters. The chapter-headings indicate satisfactorily the classification: Professional Criminalism, Deliberate Choice of Criminalism, Mental Imagery, Mental Habit, Mental Conflict and Repressions, Abnormal Sexualism, Epilepsy, Mental Abnormality in General, Mental Defect (four chapters), Mental Dullness from Physical Conditions, Psychic Constitutional Inferiority, Mental Aberrations (three chapters), Mental Peculiarities (four chapters), Pathological Stealing, etc. This second book constitutes Dr. Healy's major contribution to criminological literature. 176 case-histories are placed in turn before the reader, with comments which indicate fairly well the method of interpretation and classification.

It is impossible in a book of 830 pages to treat cases of criminality in sufficient detail to convince the reader of the correctness of

diagnosis. That is a difficulty inherent in the production of this type of book. An elaborate monograph concerning each case would still leave important questions unanswered. The author has, however, provided us with a good outline of his method, and has shown us in a large number of cases how that method was applied and what his findings were. These cannot fail to be in a high degree valuable to any reader, layman or specialist, and out of the inevitable disagreement as to interpretation will come improvement of method of analysis of character.

On its psychological side, this work makes its major claim to respect. The newer psychoanalysis is but slightly applied, and Freud, Jung, and the mass of recent psychoanalytical literature are seldom mentioned. It is questionable whether any one individual could do what Dr. Healy has done and yet offer at the same time that psychoanalytic treatment of cases which is now urgently needed by penologists. It is to be hoped that some day in the not distant future we may have a collaborated study of a 1000 individual delinquents comprising correlated studies of each individual case by a physician, a social scientist, a psychologist, and a psychoanalyst, each highly trained and competent. Dr. Healy's admirable book is frankly submitted as a preliminary study of a large question. It is a notable volume, a unique contribution to criminology, and should be utilized not only by specialists in criminology, sociology, and psychology, but by ministers, teachers, social workers, physicians—all persons whose function it is to guide youth in the process of character building.

JAMES FORD.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

A GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Edited by G. B. SMITH. The University of Chicago Press. 1916. Pp. x, 759. \$3.00.

THE BELIEF IN GOD AND IMMORTALITY. JAMES H. LEUBA. Sherman, French, & Co. 1916. Pp. xx, 340. \$2.00.

THE FOUNDATION OF MODERN RELIGION. The Cole Lectures for 1916. HERBERT B. WORKMAN, D.D., LL.D. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1916. Pp. 249. \$1.25.

IS CHRISTIANITY PRACTICABLE? WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN. Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1916. Pp. xviii, 246. \$1.25.

In the making of sermons, a text may be either a point of departure or a point of arrival. It may be taken as a statement of revealed truth calling for explication and enforcement, or, by an approach from ordinary human experience, it may be discovered as

a law of the spiritual life. Broadly speaking, behind the former method lies the old theology; behind the latter, the new. This first volume, an *Encyklopädie* of theological science, prepared by a baker's dozen of contributors, nearly all of whom are on the Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago, is decidedly a book of the new theology, and its treatment of the various theological disciplines is thoroughly modern and refreshingly frank. No book is anywhere near so good for a young student seeking a preliminary survey of the whole field of theological learning, or for older clergymen wishing to see how the different departments look, singly and in correlation, from the new point of view. Appropriately, therefore, what may be regarded as its text appears in its very last paragraph, at the close of an admirable article by G. B. Foster entitled "The Contribution of Critical Scholarship to Ministerial Efficiency": "With reference to this whole question, it may be said that usually the candidate for the ministry—young though he may sometimes be—enters the divinity school as a finished religious and theological product, but that, in consequence of his studies there, he departs unfinished, growing aware that his personality, with its religion and its theology, are alike in the making. A divinity school that achieves such a result has fulfilled its function in the life of the human spirit." And this because, as the same writer has previously said, "It is not simply truth but the truthful *man*, tried in the fires of critical theological research, that can win the confidence of our bewildered and discouraged religious life."

Dr. Leuba's book breaks cleanly into two parts: the first discusses historically and argumentatively the doctrine of immortality; the second presents the statistical results of an inquiry into the prevalence among educated persons of belief in a personal God and individual immortality. The earlier idea of immortality, arising from the exteriorization of vivid memory-images, the "sense of presence," visions and dreams, is sharply distinguished from the modern idea, which is born of moral sentiment, and which differs from the former not only in origin but also in that it conceives a future life as an object of desire instead of dread and aversion. Perhaps, however, the independence of the two ideas is exaggerated, since it is not clear that the later could have arisen except upon prepared soil, that is, unless the earlier had previously given the notion of survival which was capable of transformation. The so-called metaphysical arguments, based upon idealism and the simplicity of the soul, are summarily dismissed. The moral arguments,

derived from the thought of God and the conservation of values, are pronounced invalid save upon an *a priori* assumption that the world will satisfy the demands which human ideals make upon it. This may be granted, but surely it may be argued that there is ground for such a faith in the essential reasonableness of the world and its ability to meet the demands itself has created.

The statistical results are undoubtedly interesting and valuable, although it may be doubted whether they are quite so significant as the author supposes and are not susceptible of other interpretations than his. It may be true that college students cease to hold the beliefs in question as they advance from the Freshman to the Senior class because of growing intelligence and independence, and that the more eminent men of science, historians, sociologists, and psychologists have, for the same reason, abandoned them in larger proportion than the less eminent; but it may also be that absorbing devotion to a particular field of study inhibits interest and thought in other directions. Dr. Leuba's tables have already been used to prove the demoralizing influence of "unbelieving" teachers upon the minds of their students, quite unjustly, of course; but the argument suggests the different conclusions which may be drawn from these laboriously collected figures. It would be interesting to know the reasons which have led to disbelief, for reasons there should be if Dr. Leuba's explanation is correct; and yet he himself remarks that "the ground for their unbelief is rarely clearly formulated in their own minds" (p. 297). To answer that the change is due more to a difference in mental temper and attitude than to specific reasons suggests the rejoinder that possibly a mental attitude determined by intellectual interests alone may be less truly appreciative of reality than one influenced also by other and more broadly human considerations. But whether one agrees with the conclusions of the book or not, it is a noteworthy contribution to the literature of the subject and will richly repay prolonged and thoughtful study.

George Inness, the artist, used to make merry over his boyish chagrin at discovering, when he undertook to sketch a broad landscape, that he had not taken a sufficiently large sheet of paper. An author who tries to put the history of the Middle Ages, considered as supplying the foundation of modern religion, into six lectures needs altogether exceptional power of selection, proportion, and perspective. That Dr. Workman has not fully succeeded in so arduous an attempt is not surprising; the marvel is that he did not

fail completely. The book is replete with information, but lacking in structure as a whole. Typographical errors are numerous and there is neither index nor table of contents.

All of Dr. Brown's work shows a remarkable combination of the idealist and the man of affairs; he seeks remote ends, but is keenly aware of the practical difficulties in the way and the means which must be employed for successful advance. In theology this sort of mind exposes one to the suspicion of trying to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, because it easily becomes a habit of masking an intellectual advance by a specious use of antiquated terminology; but in treating such a subject as Dr. Brown here proposes it appears to the best advantage. His firm grasp upon the actual and the equally firm grasp of the ideal upon him make this book notable. The ideal is that of human brotherhood, represented as the Christian principle, outlined against nationalism on the one hand and individualistic otherworldliness on the other. The obsolescent individualism of what has been deemed the Christian ideal is vigorously criticised and its defect emphasized, although its value as a partial view is adequately acknowledged. The present war is regarded as a denial of the Christian principle, which denial constitutes, in the speech of theology, sin; and salvation must consist in its sincere whole-hearted acceptance as the law of social as well as individual life. So stated, the thesis of the book is commonplace enough, but it is in the considerations of its last three chapters entitled "The Christian Programme for Humanity," "The Duty for Tomorrow," "What the Church can do," that its chief and great value lies.

W. W. FENN.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE SOCIAL SURVEY. CAROL ARONOVICI, Ph.D., Director of the Bureau for Social Research of the Seybert Institution, Philadelphia. The Harper Press. 1916. Pp. 255.

Unwittingly most of us who are not engaged professionally in social service might from its title pass by this little book as too technical to be of general interest and value. "Social survey" is still new enough in common terminology to need definition. The latter may well be given in the words of the author: "The social survey is a process of qualitative and quantitative analysis of our social environment both in the past and in the present in order to make possible the visualizing and the actual creation of practical Utopias."

Primarily the book is intended by its author as a manual for the guidance of the actual workers who are to make an inventory, as it were, of the social assets and liabilities of a given community concerning which more accurate knowledge is sought. As such it is eminently practical. Chapter by chapter, the author takes up the activities and institutions of our common life which affect the welfare of the individual, states their significance, and defines their possibilities for good or for evil. He follows each chapter by a series of masterly questions by which the usefulness of the institution under observation may be accurately and scientifically measured. In the methods of approach suggested, such as the intensive study of the locality to get its particular point of vantage from which to work, enlisting the services of the influential members of the community able to give expert knowledge along various lines, and the use of the press to mould an effective public opinion, we see the hand, not of the impractical enthusiast, but of the trained worker who fully realizes both the power and the delicacy of social forces.

But the book is far more than a manual for the professional investigator. As a series of brilliant commentaries touching the high points of reform along many lines it is a stimulus to community thinking. A few illustrations will suffice to show its originality of outlook.

The sections on Americanization and on Leisure are particularly striking. It is not citizenship alone that the foreigner most needs, but assimilation—socially, industrially, intellectually. The menace at present is due to lack of the latter, not the former. Many forces may be used to bring about assimilation. One of the most neglected is the right use of leisure, not on its negative side, that of recruiting depleted energy, but on its positive, dynamic side as a creative force, a means of self-expression. In this connection the author defines art as the "highest expression of creative socialized leisure," and pleads for more of the art-forms that find their creation and expression in the people themselves. The reader is made keenly aware of the tremendous waste of splendid human material through our present system of commercialized non-social exploitation of leisure time.

Renewed emphasis is also laid on the potentialities of the churches as socializing influences, not from any particular religious standpoint, but on the basis of their already accepted ethical codes. The questions here are those which every live church-worker might well ask himself. They suggest many lines of useful activity. "Are the churches located at strategic points in relation to their membership?"

"Are church activities sufficiently diversified and attractive to hold the interest of the average mind?" "Are the ministers fearless, intelligent, progressive leaders?" "Are the churches used as forums for the discussion of specific public questions?"

Education, the author acknowledges, is "the most powerful agency in modern democracy." He pays tribute to the public school as "the purest example of a democratic institution which is ready to rise to heights that so far have not been fully appreciated." Present dissatisfaction with many aspects of school conditions he interprets as full of promise for a new era of really American education that will "coördinate the national and racial elements of the people by conserving and utilizing native abilities as an asset to industrial efficiency and American democracy."

The author also raises points of deep interest to the legislator. He condemns the tendency of laws to deal with effects rather than with causes. He emphasizes the fact that "the social function of law is not control alone": "To create a stimulus toward right action rather than the prohibition of wrong-doing is the positive task of the law."

The effect of the whole book is to socialize our thinking. It makes us see where we are going. Changes already in progress take on a new significance, and the possibilities of others about to be made become evident. We feel after reading it that we at least begin to have some of that clearness of vision which is a prerequisite for making Utopias real—the ultimate aim of a social survey.

NANCY E. SCOTT.

WILSON COLLEGE,
CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

